


# DIPLOMACY WORLD

ISSUE 77



The Replacement Player -  
Germany in the Real World

# Notes From the Editor and Hobby News

Who would have believed it? Four issues of Diplomacy World in a row released on time! Well, close to on time anyway. To be honest, only two weeks ago I barely had any material on hand to fill the pages of this issue, but a steady flow of articles have filled my mailbox since then (some expected, some unexpected), and in the end I think this issue turned out pretty well.

Let me take this opportunity to remind all you readers that Diplomacy World is only as good as the articles inside. I rely on submissions from hobby members to keep this publication going. If you've never submitted an article for publication before, why not think about trying your hand at it? You must have **something** to say that would be interesting to the readership. You can see the wide range of Diplomacy-related topics DW publishes, so it shouldn't be too hard to make your articles fit somewhere inside. Submissions don't have to be of epic proportions, either. Three or four paragraphs on a specific strategy or idea can make for very interesting reading. Keep it in mind, okay? And, by the way, a big hearty thank you to those readers who have taken the time to contribute. I really appreciate it. Without you this zine would be nothing.

Now on to some hobby news. The big Diplomacy World news is that I've created a homepage on the World Wide Web featuring Diplomacy World and many articles that have appeared inside. The address is:

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/DiplomacyWorld>

I plan to put up some, but not all, of the articles from each issue up on the page (but not until a month or two after each issue comes out). You'll also find selected articles from previous issues. There are also links there to other Dip-related sites, including Web pages for zines like League of Nations, Diplodocus, and Spring Offensive. I hope this web page will bring Diplomacy World to a whole new segment of the Diplomacy hobby, and with luck we'll pick up some new subscribers here and there.

For those of you who don't have access to the World Wide Web, do not despair; Diplomacy World will continue to be, first and foremost, a printed publication for as long as I am editor. The only way to see the entire publication is to subscribe through the mail.

In other DW-related news, I'm happy to report that Avalon Hill's The General magazine will be reprinting Tim Hoyt's article Sun Tzu and the Art of War, which originally appeared in Diplomacy World #76. Look for it in the issue of The General that features Colonial Diplomacy on the cover. I'm told it should be out sometime in February.

In other hobby news, you'll find elsewhere in this issue of

DW flyers for two of the bigger Diplomacy happenings this year - DixieCon and DipCon. This year's DipCon, to be held in Ohio, also has the distinction of hosting World DipCon (an honor we haven't had in the US for a number of years). Larry Peery is doing a lot of promotional work to try and attract a large number of foreign participants to World DipCon, for which he should receive our thanks.

In other face-to-face news, we have two announcements from Brad Wilson. First, **SHORECON IV**, the hobby's only housecon with a beach, will be June 6-13 at 1748 Avalon Ave., Avalon, NJ. Second, **VERTIGO GAMES X**, the hobby's only housecon with a hot tub, will be August 30-September 2 (Labor Day weekend) at 302 Friendship Drive, Paoli, PA. For info on either of these housecons, write to Brad at PO Box 532, Paoli, PA 19301-0532. Don't miss your chance to lob water balloons at Jack McHugh when he's not looking!

On the zine front, we've seen a few folds recently, which I've reported on here. Phil Reynold's Akrasia is the latest casualty. Phil had to fold it for personal health reasons, but as of now he will continue as the Orphan Director. The folds never seem to stop, do they?

Fortunately, there are a few bright spots in the hobby lately. One of them is Jamie McQuinn's new zine, Crossing the Rubicon. Jamie has been a sub-zine publisher for some time now, first in Cogniscenti and later in my zine Maniac's Paradise; in both cases his claim to fame has been running PBM Scrabble. In this new zine, he'll continue that tradition, and at the same time will run Diplomacy, Gunboat, and Colonial Diplomacy. Running on six-week deadlines, Jamie charges \$0.75 an issue and no game fees.

The other recent new zine is another entry in my Whining Kent Pig Publishing Empire. I've started a zine called Grand Hyatt, which will run only the late Fred Hyatt's Diplomacy variant Colonia (and Gunboat Colonia if the demand is there). Colonia is a nine-player worldwide variant that has a small but loyal following. Gene Prosnitz has an article in this issue of Diplomacy World explaining why he believes this is the greatest Diplomacy variant ever created. In fact, it was Gene's searching for a place to play Colonia that started me longing for one as well, and that eventually motivated me enough to start the zine! Issues are 50 cents each, with \$5 gamefees and a six-week deadlines.

I guess that wraps up my ramblings for another issue. My deadline for the next issue of Diplomacy World will be May 9, 1996. Please try to get all articles and contributions to me before then. And you don't have to wait until the last minute - the sooner I get articles the sooner I can lay out the issue. Hope you enjoy this issue of DW, and I'll see you in 3 months!

## In This Issue:

<b>Editorial:</b> <i>Notes From the Editor</i> by Douglas Kent	Page 2
<b>Hobby News:</b> <i>World DipCon V Report</i> by Francois Rivasseau	Page 4
<b>Strategy &amp; Tactics:</b> <i>Machiavelli's "The Prince": A Textbook for Diplomacy</i> by Tim Hoyt	Page 5
<b>Variants:</b> <i>Why I Love Colonia VII</i> by Gene Prosnitz	Page 8
<b>Feature Cover Story:</b> <i>The Replacement Player - Germany in the Real World</i> by Brent McKee	Page 9
<b>Strategy &amp; Tactics:</b> <i>Diplomatic Schizophrenia</i> by David Partridge	Page 13
<b>Hobby History:</b> <i>Diplomacy World History - A Look at Issue #4</i> by David Hood	Page 15
<b>Number Crunching:</b> <i>The Endgame in Diplomacy: An Electronic Conversation</i> by Mark Nelson	Page 16
<b>Letter Column:</b> <i>Knives and Daggers - The Diplomacy World Letter Column</i>	Page 18
<b>Off the Board:</b> <i>Railway Rivals Demo Game</i> by Eric Brosius	Page 19
<b>Demo Game:</b> <i>Spring and Fall 1902 Turn Results</i>	Page 25
<b>Reader Commentary:</b> <i>Foolhardy #20</i>	Page 29
<b>New Blood Listing:</b> Individuals interested in seeing samples of Diplomacy zines	Page 30
<b>Outside Opinion:</b> <i>New Zealand PBM Championships - Blueprint for Disaster</i> by Brendan Whyte	Page 31
<b>Hobby Services and Game Openings Listing</b>	Page 32

## DIPLMACY WORLD STAFF:

Managing Editor:	Douglas Kent, 10214 Black Hickory Rd., Dallas, TX 75243 Email: 73567.1414@compuserve.com or DipWorld@aol.com
Strategy & Tactics Editor:	Vacant
Variant Editor:	Stephen Agar, 79 Florence Rd., Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 6DL, UK Email: 100276.775@compuserve.com
Interview Editor:	Vacant
Electronic Mail Editor:	Mark Nelson, 1st Floor Front Flat, 3 Kelso Road, Leeds, LS2, UK Email: fuemin@sun.leeds.ac.uk
Club and Tournament Editor:	Don Del Grande, 142 Eliseo Dr., Greenbrae, CA 94904-1339 Email: del_gran@ix.netcom.com

Contributors: Eric Brosius, Jef Bryant, Jim Burgess, Alan Calhamer, Brian Cannon, Pat Conlon, Stewart Cross, David Hood, Melinda Holley, Tim Hoyt, Brent McKee, John Norris, Mike Oliveri, David Partridge, Thomas Pasko, Larry Peery, Gene Prosnitz, Francois Rivasseau, David P. Smith, Fred Townsend, Brendan Whyte, W. Andrew York.

Subscriptions are four issues for \$10.00 in the US, \$15.00 in the Canada or overseas surface and \$20.00 via overseas air mail. The last issue will appear on your label. All overseas subscribers are urged to use the International Subscription Exchange listed elsewhere in this issue. All subscriptions and address changes should be sent to the Managing Editor listed above. Make checks and money orders payable to Douglas Kent in US currency. UK subscribers can purchase Diplomacy World subscriptions directly from Stephen Agar at 79 Florence Rd., Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 6DL. Subscriptions for persons in the UK from Stephen are L7/4 issues - that's more than 40% cheaper than the \$20/4 issues airmail price!

Contributions are welcomed and will earn you one free issue per submission published unless otherwise stated. Persons interested in the vacant positions may contact the managing editor for details or to submit their candidacy or both. The same goes for anyone interested in becoming a columnist or senior writer.

Diplomacy is a game manufactured by The Avalon Hill Game Company of Baltimore, MD and the name is their trademark with all rights reserved.

# World DipCon V Report

by Francois Rivasseau

Although late preparation and the general strike in France did complicate matters, we were fortunate enough for World DipCon V to attract 95 players, plus 12 additional players that are either members of the Organization Committee or were players in only the Nations Cup or Gunboat Championship.

Foreign participation was high. Among those attending were delegations from Sweden (including Bjorn von Knorring, Per Westling, Leif Bergman and Joel Grunberg among others), Norway (European Champion Inge Kjøl and others), the UK (Shaun Derrick, James Hardy and Stephen Cox and others), Belgium (Bruno Berken and two others), and the USA (Daniel Loeb and Susan Castagne). Venios Angelopoulos came from Athens to represent Greece as well. In addition to these attendees, there were players from Spain, Italy, Portugal and Algeria who are temporarily living in France and therefore did not have to travel. In total, 25 foreign players from 11 countries took part in this event.

These numbers may appear small, especially compared to the almost 200 players who attended the last French EuroDipCon. However, it should be taken into account that the strikes dissuaded a lot of people to attend from the suburbs of Paris (even Lei Saarleimen, one of the Con organizers, could not come), and even more from the French provinces, not to mention the foreign players who cancelled their trips. Based on letters signifying intentions to attend, we estimate there would have been close to 200 players this time as well if circumstances had been more convenient.

I should also mention that those French players that did attend were very skillful and motivated people. Among them we had 1994 Eurochampion Xavier Blanchot, as well as others such as Stephane Gentric, Eric Marchland, Herve Sicard and Francois Sommaire. 1994 World Champion Pascal Montagna could not take part in the tournament, but was present on the last day to present the trophy to the new champion. Quality somehow did replace quantity. It isn't very often you see three European Champions and two World Champions in the same room! Let's try to do even better in Ohio.

Five rounds of Diplomacy were played, with players allowed to play no more than 4 rounds each. A total of 41 games were played in the 5 rounds (not including the 9 games played in the Nation's Cup and Gunboat Tournament).

Our new World Champion is Bruno-Andre Giraudon. He is a well-known French player. Everybody agrees he deserved this title more than anybody as he is a regular on the podiums of World DipCons. Bruno-Andre placed 3rd in Australia in 1993, and 3rd again in the UK in 1994. Besides the title, he received two special prizes: a financial allowance of 3000 French Francs (about \$600 US) offered by Jeux Descartes (who markets the French version of Diplomacy) to travel to the next World DipCon; and a special trophy cup, the WorldDip Cup, which will be passed on to the next World Champion in Ohio.

Second place went to a Portuguese citizen, Tony Ribeiro Da Silva, who is living in France and well-known in the French hobby.

Third place went to a young and promising French player, Thomas Scebeyran. Sigurd Eskeland (8th) was the first non-French speaking player. Vittoria De Pino (59th) was the first female, and

Jean-Noel Rivasseau (47th) was the youngest player (14 1/2 years old).

Allow me to say a few words regarding ethical conduct during the tournament. During this WDC we made public the oath of ethics designed within the EDA for the next EuroDipCon. Basically, these Oath of Ethics requires players to a) play to maximize their own score; b) avoid crossgaming; c) act properly, in a statesman-like fashion when conducting diplomacy; and d) never attack or ally with someone because of ethnic or geographic reasons. Everybody was warned that the referees would watch closely for violations of the ethical code. It was not necessary for the referees to act in any way, as the warning proved sufficient.

The conclusion I drew from this experience is that heightening the sensibilities of players in regard to the ethical aspects of game play improved both the level of play and the atmosphere of the tournament, particularly for the travelers who did not have to fear a savage coalition of local players cooperating against them. That is why I recommend that a similar code of ethics be adopted for all future World DipCons.

At the Hobbymeet, the bid of Columbus, Ohio as the site of the next World DipCon was accepted. WDC VI will be held there from July 4 to July 7, 1996. Larry Peery and Bruce Reiff presented the bid. Sweden and Norway announced they plan to present a bid for WDC VII to be held in Scandinavia. This idea received unanimous support. It was also agreed upon that no country can have more than ten votes on any ballot during hobby meetings. If this rule is agreed to in Ohio it will become definitive (and during that vote in Ohio the rule will be enforced).

## World DipCon V Results

### Best Players

- 1) B.A. Giraudon
- 2) T. Ribeiro Da Silva
- 3) T. Scebeyran
- 4) A. Sedjai
- 5) S. Gentric
- 6) T. Seguin
- 7) D. Le Cam
- 8) S. Eskeland
- 9) C. Sevin
- 10) L. Feldmann

### Best Countries

Austria: D. Le Cam  
England: T. Ribeiro Da Silva  
France: X. Blanchot  
Germany: Y. Agostini  
Italy: T. Scebeyran  
Russia: T. Ribeiro Da Silva  
Turkey: A. Scheffer

## Nations' Cup World Team Championship

Winner: Sweden Team #2 (Jerewing, Westling, Danngarde)

## Gunboat World Championship

Winner: Yohann Agostini (a 14-center Italy)

# Niccolo Machiavelli's "The Prince": A Textbook for Diplomacy

by Tim Hoyt

(Token Disclaimer: In the interest of political correctness, it is appropriate to note that most people consider the adjective "Machiavellian" both pejorative and demeaning; it is usually used as an insult. Most people have not read "The Prince", but almost certainly have an opinion about it anyway. I would not recommend that anyone bring up this article in polite company, or that anyone take the musings of the author as in any way suggesting that Machiavelli was anything other than a thug, a fascist, and a blackguard: such ideas simply won't do in the enlightened New World Order which, as we know, represents the end of history. The Author neither confirms nor denies that he has actually read "The Prince", or that it influences his Diplomacy play in the slightest, and if questioned in a court of law will dissemble to the best of his ability. Obviously, any negative repercussions for this fall strictly on Doug Kent's head-he's responsible, so blame him. This may seem Machiavellian to you: well, in the words of Frances Urquhart, you might think so, but I certainly couldn't comment.)

Niccolo Machiavelli's often-slandered volume "The Prince", written in 1513, remains one of the single most important works in Western political thought, and represents one of the fundamental readings in Western political science. "The Prince" was written in response to the decay of the Italian states-system. For over a century, Venice, Milan, Florence, the Papacy, and the Kingdom of Naples had vied for supremacy in the Italian peninsula, changing alliances and policies in order to ensure that no one state became supreme. Late in the 15th century, in an effort to change the regional balance of power, Italian states invited first France and later the Hapsburg Empire (Spain and Austria, at the time) to participate in inter-Italian warfare. The outside powers proved overwhelmingly powerful: even coalitions of all five Italian states failed to successfully resist French and Hapsburg armies. By the middle of the 16th century, Italy had become a battleground for the ambitions of France and the Empire, and the Italian states found their sovereignty and freedom of action declining as they relied increasingly on alliances with one or the other of the two "great powers".

This may sound familiar. Seven powers, two at "the comers" (in this case, France and the Empire), with the central powers attempting to maintain a balance of power and the "Wicked Witches" ultimately struggling for hegemony. I suspect that many of us have played Diplomacy games which followed this script virtually to the letter. The wars of the Italian states, in fact, represent the first real "balance of power" system in modern Western history. Avalon Hill produced a game called "Machiavelli", based on this struggle with the addition of an eighth power, the perfidious Ottomans (who spend a lot of time lurking about in the eastern Mediterranean). The rules are much more complicated than Diplomacy, and much more subtle, which may be one reason the game never caught on in a big way. (I've got a set, but have never actually played the damn thing <grin>).

Machiavelli wrote "The Prince" for Lorenzo de Medici, ruler of Florence. It was intended as a primer of sorts: a distillation of Machiavelli's service in the Italian wars to date and a reflection

on recent Italian history. The intent, from Machiavelli's perspective, was to help Medici rule in such a way that not only ensured his survival and that of his dynasty, but also in a way that would permit Italy to be free of foreign occupation and invasion. One of the last lines of the book reads "THIS BARBARIAN OCCUPATION STINKS IN THE NOSTRILS OF ALL OF US", and the last chapter (XXVI) is entitled "Exhortation to Free Italy From the Barbarians". Much of the text is related to the duties of the Prince regarding his internal problems: when to oppress, when to cajole, when to bribe, and that sort of thing. Some of these passages are interesting for Diplomacy players as well, but most of this article will reflect on Machiavelli's observations of the international system as he knew it. His perspective, in many ways, can be compared to that of a Diplomacy player with three centers in the end game: he knows what went wrong, and has some good ideas about how to fix it, but it may simply be too late.

That said, let's take a look at some of Machiavelli's recommendations, and apply them to Diplomacy. I've taken the liberty of organizing them into several categories for consideration. I've included the Chapter and line numbers of each passage for those who are inclined to look them up.

## GENERAL STRATEGY:

III:146-149, 165-168) The Romans in these matters acted as all wise princes should, having regard not only to present ills but to future ones as well and preparing for the latter with all possible care. For if evils are anticipated they can be easily remedied...On this account they were willing to make war with Philip and Antiochus [leaders of other empires] in Greece rather than have to fight them in Italy though at the time they could have avoided either course.

III:253-254) a war is never avoided but merely postponed to your disadvantage.

Diplomacy is, ultimately, a game of conquest. To win, you have to grab half of Europe, arranging and discarding alliances with gleeful abandon as you stomp your way to rightful hegemony. Using that perspective, it makes sense to assume that every state is an enemy, and that war is inevitable. Cooperation, as we shall see below, has dividends, and is absolutely necessary to win the game. But refraining from involvement in a conflict may simply mean that when you go to war with the winner, it will be on their terms and they will be stronger for having defeated their present opponent. One of the most fundamental errors in Diplomacy is to rest on your laurels, especially in the midgame. Just because you've knocked out your neighbor and feel secure doesn't mean that you don't have enemies. Your neighbor's neighbor, who was probably your ally in the recent war, has just become a threat. (See the article on "Kautilya" a couple of issues ago, the author notes with a shameless plug. What was the deal on royalties for back issues, Doug?). And whoever you have been allied with is going to be either looking at you with visions of barbecue sauce and some minced onion, or else is about to continue expanding in other venues, and when he gets strong enough you'll be the next meal.

Sorry, folks, but the war isn't over until you control the world.  
BWA HA HA HA!

### GENEROSITY AND INJURY

VIII:138-142) For injuries should be given committed all at once so that, there being less time to feel them, they give less offense, and favors should be dealt out a few at a time so that their effect may be more enduring.

XVI:76-83) among the things a prince must guard against is precisely the danger of becoming an object either of contempt or hatred. Generosity leads you to both these evils, wherefore it is wiser to accept the name of miserly...than to seek a reputation for generosity...

There is no greater injury you can do to someone than to stab them. Therefore, in the words of the Bard, "... 'tis best done quickly..." Every alliance has tensions: it's hard for two people seeking to maximize advantage at the expense of the other while still cooperating not to have minor, or indeed major, disagreements. The single worst thing you can do is to try to weasel your way a little bit at a time while the other guy's busy elsewhere. "Gee, I just took Rumania-it's not really a stab, and you don't lose anything because you got a center somewhere else..." Don't spend a lot of time whining, either: "PLEEZ can I have Rum, sniff sniff". These kinds of things may make your ally, with whom things seemed to be going so swimmingly while you were getting your way, just turn around and smack you upside the head. If you're going to put the knife in, do it well, in a way that really hurts. If you're not willing to stab yet, quit your complaining and do something productive. In the words of the great Bogart (sorry, I'm in a literary mood), "I don't mind parasites-it's cut rate ones I can't stand."

Generosity is another issue. In an effort to be cooperative, some people give away the store. Sure, why not give Turkey Rumania early in the game-it's no biggie if the Sultan will be your ally. NOT! If you give up important stuff to easily, your ally or neighbors may think you're soft, which is a good way to find yourself in exile somewhere like sunny Yakutsk or scenic Devil's Island. Or even that island in the Orkneys that humans can't live on any more because the British government was testing interesting weapons on it in the Second World War...

### "POWER POLITICS":

XVIII:78-83) In actions of all men and especially of princes, where there is no court of appeal, the end is all that counts. Let a prince then concern himself with the acquisition or the maintenance of a state; the means employed will always be considered honorable and praised by all, for the mass of mankind is always swayed by appearances and the outcome of an enterprise.

XVII:28-38) Here the question arises; whether it is better to be loved than feared or feared than loved. The answer is that it would be desirable to be both but, since that is difficult, it is much safer to be feared than loved, if one must choose. For on men in general this observation may be made: they are ungrateful, fickle, and deceitful, eager to avoid dangers, and avid for gain, and while you are useful to them they are all with you, offering you their blood, their property, their lives and their sons so long as danger is remote...but when it approaches they turn

on you.

Gee, and you wondered why "Machiavellian" is considered a bad word? Well, Machiavelli was practical: he knew the difference between the society he lived in and the way idealists wanted to live. The same is true today, although our society is one hell of a lot closer to an ideal one than 16th century Italy. Freedom has always had its price: part of that price is the rule of law, and the costs of law and order are, in some instances, repression, deceit, and fear. In Diplomacy, the only law is force: if you can't defend yourself, nobody else will volunteer to help you unless they get something out of it. The problem with being loved is that it won't necessarily keep you from getting trampled. Everybody in this game has the same victory conditions, and the odds are that sooner or later, you will be a target. It's a nasty, dog-eat-dog world out there, so for goodness sake don't be a cat.

### ON LYING:

XVIII:27-30) a wise leader cannot and should not keep his word when keeping it is not to his advantage or when the reasons that made him give it are no longer valid.

XVIII:54-57) It is good to appear clement, trustworthy, humane, religious, and honest, and also to be so, but always with the mind so disposed that, when the occasion arises not to be so, you can become the opposite.

See above. Let's be honest: one problem with a game like Diplomacy is that people can take it personally. It is, in fact, something we all probably do once in a while. Let's also remember that it is a game. I recently had a private exchange with another player after a stab. He took it pretty well, but argued strongly that keeping one's word is both a better means of play and also a more effective one. I'm ambivalent, at best, about both arguments. Actions taken in Diplomacy should have no more bearing on one's moral character than actions on a stage: it is a game, a role, and does not in any way necessarily reflect one's personal standards or beliefs. As a more effective means of play, there is some truth to that, particularly in a gaming community where reputations are known. "Cross-gaming", which is frequently condemned, is a part of life: a player with a reputation for honesty and an utter lack of double-dealing will gain more allies in the long-run than one who is known to stab everyone at the first opportunity. On the other hand, that player will also frequently get hammered by less scrupulous allies once his usefulness is over. Even nasty Machiavellian player's can cultivate a reputation for honesty and integrity, within limits.

### ALLIANCES:

XXI:40-47) A prince is also esteemed when he shows himself a true friend or a true enemy, that is, when, without reservation, he takes his stand with one side or the other. This is always wiser than trying to be neutral, for if two powerful neighbors of yours fall out they are either of such sort that the victor may give you reason to fear him or they are not. In either case it will be better for you to take sides and wage an honest war.

XXI:72-81) if the prince chooses his side boldly, and his ally wins, even though the latter be powerful and the prince be at his mercy, nonetheless there is a bond of obligation and



friendship...if your ally be the loser then he will welcome you and, as long as he can, he will give you aid...

XXI:82-91) when the two contestants are of such stature that you will have nothing to fear from the victor, it is even more prudent to take part in the war for you will accomplish the ruin of one with the aid of the other who, had he been wise, should rather have supported him. For with your aid he is sure to win and, winning, put himself in your power. And here it should be noted that a prince should never ally himself with one more powerful to attack another unless absolutely driven by necessity...

III:111-114) one,,,must make himself a leader and defender of his less powerful neighbors and strive to weaken the stronger ones...

XIX:13-15) a prince will be despised if he is considered changeable, frivolous...cowardly, or irresolute...

The meat of the Diplomacy game, with apologies to vegetarians, is the necessity to ally with other players, and get them to help you win. Players who have mastered the art of Diplomacy still don't win every game, or even half their games, over time. But the passages above provide some useful hints on how to view the utility of given alliances. If you are already engaged in a war, neutrality in a second conflict may be the best option. If you are not engaged in a war, and two of your neighbors begin fighting, neutrality is an extremely weak option. You must always be looking ahead to see what other powers are growing, and allow these perceptions to guide your alliance choices in the middle game. Ensure that others do not grow strong by allying with their weak enemies: a modest commitment of units on your part can severely slow the growth of your potential competitors. Allying with a stronger power to attack someone must only be done in extreme circumstances. To paraphrase Winston Churchill in 1941, when England allied with the Soviet Union to defeat Hitler: "To defeat my enemies I would sup with the Devil himself, but I should make sure to use a long spoon."

#### NEW PLAYERS AND SUBSTITUTES:

XVIII: 57-61) It must be understood that a prince and particularly a new prince cannot practice all the virtues for which men are accounted good, for the necessity of the state often compels him to take actions which are opposed to loyalty, charity, humanity, and religion.

XXIV: 4-9) For the actions of a new prince are much more closely scrutinized than those of an established one, and when they are seen to be intelligent and effective they may win over more men and create stronger bonds of obligation than have been felt in the old line, inasmuch as the minds of men are wrapped up in the present and not in the past.

These words are particularly addressed to new players and substitutes. The quickest way to get beaten in your first few games is to trust too much. People are going to try to wax you, and you have to be prepared to do unto others. Substitutes in mail games, both snail and electronic, face a slightly different situation: they have inherited positions (usually inferior) from players who simply didn't give a damn. Often, their position is

complicated by an NMR (no move received) the previous turn. In these circumstances, survival often calls for the most drastic of power politics: lie early, lie often, do whatever it takes to secure support and keep it for a few turns, and make it clear that you have not joined the game to provide dinner for the other piranhas, but have a little nibbling of your own to do before you go. Offer accommodation, if necessary, but drive a hard bargain: if you're going to ally with someone, try to make it contingent on joint moves against a third party. Don't wait for others to approach you, though-they're looking at you as lunch.

#### CONCLUSION:

XXI: 101-106) Let no state think that it can always adopt a safe course; rather should it be understood that all choices involve risks, for the order of things is such that one never escapes one danger without incurring another; prudence lies in weighing the disadvantages of each choice and taking the least bad as good.

This is, in this author's humble opinion, one of the most important facts of both international relations and Diplomacy (the game and the practice). Every action has consequences, and every decision has good and bad aspects. The best outcome can always be doubted and questioned, because perfection is unattainable. The defeat of the Soviet Union after forty years of Cold War has not provided the utopian world sought by idealists: instead, we have seen the Gulf War (which we won but lost, since Saddam Hussein is still around), changing security requirements which have increased the role of U.S. and multi-national forces in ethnic conflicts around the globe, increased concerns over the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons in the developing world.

At the time of this writing (9 February 1996) the "People's Republic" of China is preparing massive military maneuvers off the coast of Taiwan (also known as the "Republic of China"), and demanded that the U.S. cease all arms shipments to Taiwan. New evidence has recently been released that the PRC is selling sophisticated missile guidance technology to Iran, and has provided both ballistic missiles and critical nuclear weapons production components to Pakistan. U.S. law states that the President must impose economic sanctions on China for all of these violations. Business and economic interests argue that we cannot afford to risk access to the Chinese market or the loss of trade from that country. The Chinese government, noted for such staunch humanist measures as genocide in Tibet, running over student protesters with tanks, execution and imprisonment of democratic activists, and condoning both infanticide and slave labor, has recently announced a return to sounder ideological principles: a euphemism, perhaps, for yet another anti-democracy purge. Lest I sound like an unrepentant Cold Warrior, let me state categorically that the New World Order is unquestionably a safer and more just world than the Cold War international system. But without stooping to China-bashing, it doesn't take a genius to see that not every country subscribes to our ideals, and that states still use force to achieve goals which they cannot reach through other means. Don't throw your copy of "The Prince" out yet-it's going to be useful for more than just Diplomacy for some time to come.

*{Tim Hoyt is a favorite DW contributor, now immortalized in The General as well.}*

# Why I Love Colonia VII

by Gene Prosnitz

I'm writing this article to urge hobbyists to play Colonia VII, the Diplomacy variant invented by Fred Hyatt. In my opinion, Colonia is the best, and the most interesting, Diplomacy game ever invented.

Its called Colonia VII because there were seven revisions of the map and of the assignment of colonies before reaching the present version, where all nine powers are of approximately equal strength.

To my knowledge, Colonia is the only Diplomacy game where most of the great powers have clusters of centers widely separated from each other, in contrast to regular Diplomacy, where each power starts with a contiguous group of centers. Thus, in Colonia, you may be engaged in four separate wars in four parts of the globe, with different enemies and allies in each sector.

The map is world wide, with 136 supply centers, 47 non-supply center land spaces, and 64 sea spaces. There are 19 island supply centers in the Pacific and Indian Oceans which are totally surrounded by water.

At the start of the game, there are four colonial powers, two semi-colonial powers, and three land mass powers, with starting supply centers as follows:

England: Two at home, one each in South America, Southeast Asia and Africa.

Netherlands: Two at home, one each in North America, Africa and the Pacific.

Spain: Two at home, one each in North America, Africa and the Pacific.

Portugal: Two at home, one each in North America, South America and India.

France: Three at home, one each in North America and Africa.

Austria: Three at home, one each in South America and the Pacific.

Russia: Five at home (Europe and Asia), one in Africa.

Ottoman: Four at home, one in the Pacific.

China: Four at home, no colonies.

The colonies are surrounded by neutral centers, so that by the end of the second year, a colonial power might have approximately sixteen centers, spread out with four different

clusters of four centers each in widely separated areas.

The victory criteria is 50 centers. Most games end in draws, I know of only two games which resulted in a win.

The rules are the same as regular Diplomacy, with one big difference. Any power can build in a colonial home center. For example, England starts off with five centers: London, Liverpool, Nigeria, Malaya and Ecuador. Only England can builds in London and Liverpool. However, an enemy power which captures Nigeria, Ecuador or Malaya can build there. The colonial home centers are all of the original home centers outside of Europe, except for Omsk, Vladivostok and the Chinese home centers (and the Ottoman home centers).

Here are the reasons why I like Colonia:

(1) The size of the board makes the game much more complex.

(2) In Colonia, you need a global strategy. Your decision on why to ally with in Africa will affect developments in America, Europe and the Pacific. You may have to plan four separate campaigns in different areas.

(3) The existence of so many separate areas gives you a lot more strategic options, and increases the likelihood of a successful survival strategy. In regular Diplomacy, even the best players will be doomed, if ganged up on by two or three neighbors. In Colonia, you may be ganged up on in one area, but survive with strength in a different part of the world, where the powers present, and the alliance configurations, are different.

(4) There are many more permutations and combinations. In a recent game, as Netherlands, at one point I was allied with England and Portugal in North America, and was allied with Russia and Ottoman in Africa. Meanwhile, England and Russia were at war in Europe, and Portugal and Ottoman were at war in Asia.

(5) Overall strategy, concentrating on the big picture, becomes more important than center grabbing, even when we are talking about neutral centers whose capture won't offend anyone. In regular Diplomacy it would be unheard of to pass up two neutral center builds in the second year. Yet in Colonia I achieved a powerful positional advantage by doing this in one game. I could afford it because the bypass of the two neutral centers still left me with 13 centers at the end of the second year.

(6) Colonia has strategic challenges which don't exist in regular Diplomacy, such as how to link up your forces. Isolated colonies can be vulnerable, you can strengthen your



position by linking up two of your colonies. In a recent game, won by Netherlands, the Dutch successfully linked up their forces in Florida and Melbourne, and created a power base stretching across the South Pacific and through Mexico and Central America.

(7) Related to the above is the strategy of trading colonies. This is difficult to achieve, and rarely seen, and takes a lot of trust, but it can be powerful. In one game (played on the former map) Netherlands started with colonies in Surinam and India, while Ottoman started with a colony in Brazil. The Dutch and Turks traded Brazil for India, the trade taking place at the end of the third year. This had a devastating effect. Netherlands obtained a double colony in South America, and conquered all of South America. Also, the Dutch fleets which left India hooked up with the Dutch forces in Angola to conquer all of southern Africa.

Meanwhile, Ottoman combined India with the Near East and was able to conquer all of southern Asia, and was able to establish an unbroken power base running from Morocco to Siam.

The result, an early three-way draw between Netherlands, Ottoman, and their other ally, Russia.

(Note that when you trade colonies you are trading 3 or 4 centers each).

(8) In regular Diplomacy, most countries' building centers are close together, and the only real tactical choice is whether to build an army or a fleet. In Colonia, you have the question of what part of the world to build in. Sometimes, it is a good strategy to decline to take all of your builds, so that you can build in a key area the next year. In short, you have more complex strategic and tactical options.

(9) Annihilations are more important in Colonia, since the enemy will often be unable to rebuild in that part of the globe. When fighting a war in the colonial areas, it is usually better strategy to go for the annihilation than to go for a supply center, especially on a spring move.

(10) Convoys are more important in Colonia than in regular Diplomacy, because they enable you to transfer units to a different sector of the board where there are limited opportunities to build. In a recent game won by Netherlands, the Dutch started their invasion of South America by a surprise build of an army in Melbourne and a convoy to Chile, catching the Portuguese defenders by surprise. (Winter builds and Spring moves were combined in one turn).

(11) Naval warfare has a greater role in Colonia; as stated earlier there are 19 island supply centers in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, accessible only by sea. Builds in this part of the world are almost always fleets, the above Melbourne army being a rare exception.

(12) Stalemate lines are almost non-existent in Colonia. There are a few; for example, two Turkish armies in Baghdad and Armenia can hold off a land invasion from the east, as long as Russia is friendly and as long as the invaders can not break through by sea into the Arabian Sea and Persian Gulf.

In short, Colonia is a great game. I strongly urge people to try it. And I hope some GMs will run games. I offer to GM a game if someone will publish it.

*{Gene Prosnitz is a long-time PBM Diplomacy player, and obviously a variant fan as well.}*

---

## The Replacement Player - Germany in the Real World

by Brent McKee

Have you ever played against one of the master players: someone legendary for their skills in negotiation, tactical insight and the ability to see and act on opportunities as they develop; in short, someone that it's a pleasure to lose to. Unfortunately, halfway through the game this dream player drops out and is replaced by the player from Hell. Arrogant, self centered, bullying, with the tactical insight of an ant, who misjudges every situation. Of course this could never happen in real life. Except that in Germany in 1890 it really did happen.

For almost thirty years Otto von Bismarck directed the foreign and domestic policies first of Prussia then Germany. Bismarck was first and foremost a pragmatist: policies and alliances shifted as circumstances dictated. What never

changed was that he would do whatever was necessary to strengthen Prussia and Germany. Every power in Europe was a potential ally and enemy. This was never clearer than in the German wars of unification. Prussia allied with Austria in 1864 to defeat Denmark, but in 1867 went to war against Austria with the tacit approval of France. In 1870 Prussia fought France while Austria-Hungary, if not allied with Prussia, was not hostile. The rewards of these wars were great. War with Denmark brought Prussia parity with Austria in Germany. The Austrian war ended Austria's influence in Germany and gave Prussia control of Northern Germany. Finally, the war with France led to German unification under the leadership of Prussia, and Bismarck.

The Franco-Prussian War also created Germany's greatest

problem because of the humiliating terms that ended the war. France was forced to cede Alsace and Lorraine to Germany and to pay a huge indemnity (equal, on a per capita basis, to that levied on Prussia by France in 1809). The military, supported by Wilhelm I, insisted on these terms against the wishes of Bismarck. Germany's demands eliminated the possibility of the sort of "peace of reconciliation" that had been reached with Austria. Instead a "revanchist" spirit developed in France, focussed on redeeming Alsace and Lorraine. However both Bismarck and the French leadership realized France could not fight Germany alone; they needed allies.

Bismarck's foreign policy was based on two points: the isolation of France and the preservation of peace between Austria and Russia. Bismarck needed stability in Europe to keep France isolated and that meant preventing conflict between Austria and Russia. Bismarck's initial effort was the original Dreikaiserbund (Three Emperors' League), a general convention binding on no one, which called for consultations when situations arose. Possibly the one thing uniting the powers was that they were conservative monarchies and France wasn't. Historian A.J.P. Taylor has written that "The League of the Three Emperors was supposed to secure the peace of Europe. It survived only so long as the peace of Europe was secure. Monarchical solidarity was a luxury which was blown to the winds as soon as Russia and Austria-Hungary saw their eastern interests in danger." That happened following the Russo-Turkish War of 1877. The settlement forced Russia to give back most of her gains in the Balkans, restored the Austro-Russian rivalry and destroyed the Dreikaiserbund.

Bismarck was forced to remake his foreign policy. He set out to create more binding relationships, beginning with a treaty with Austria-Hungary. Twenty-five years earlier Bismarck had opposed such a treaty, likening it to "tying our neat, sea-worthy frigate to Austria's worm eaten old galleon", but in 1874 an alliance made sense. Both parties were obliged to go to war if either were attacked by Russia and to maintain benevolent neutrality in wars with other powers. For Bismarck, Austria was a secondary power that Germany could dominate. The new treaty secured Germany's southern border and was intended as a lever to bring Russia into a new alliance. It was never meant to be the central plank of Germany's foreign policy.

Wilhelm I opposed the Austrian treaty and even considered abdicating until he realized that Bismarck was more indispensable than he was. Wilhelm's objection was based on his close family relationship to Tsar Alexander II and because Russia's role in restoring Prussian independence in 1813. Bismarck also wanted a treaty with Russia. He felt there was no valid reason to fight Russia and in any case Russia was too big to really defeat. He certainly didn't want to fight Russia and France together. Nor did he want Germany dragged into a war over the Balkans, which he felt weren't worth "the healthy bones of a Pomeranian

musketeer". Thus Bismarck moved to draw Russia into a renewed Dreikaiserbund, a mutual defense pact in which if one power were attacked the other two would maintain "benevolent neutrality". This wasn't enough for Bismarck. The new Dreikaiserbund was allowed to lapse in 1887, and Bismarck negotiated his final masterpiece, the Reinsurance Treaty, with Russia. The treaty was secret, and for good reason. It promised neutrality if either party was attacked. This meant that Russia would be neutral if France attacked Germany. It also meant that Germany would remain neutral if Austria attacked Russia, which contradicted the spirit of the treaty with Austria.

Events began to conspire against Bismarck. His power derived from his ability to get things done for Wilhelm I. The Kaiser wasn't terribly intelligent but he knew enough to realize that he needed Bismarck. Bismarck's fear was that his "master" would die. Bismarck expected that he would lose his position under the liberal Crown Prince, Friedrich. Then in 1887 Friedrich was diagnosed with inoperable throat cancer. When Wilhelm I died in 1888, Friedrich was barely able to speak and too weak to attend the funeral. He lived just 99 days after his father's death and was succeeded by his son Wilhelm II. Bismarck had high hopes for the new emperor, who had spent time studying at the Foreign Ministry under Bismarck's son Herbert. Yet within two years of Wilhelm taking the throne, Bismarck and his son were removed from office.

Wilhelm II was a complex character. Difficulties in his delivery resulted in his left arm being shortened and withered, which he continually tried to hide. He held gloves to create the illusion that his arm was longer, and avoided being photographed from the left side. Wilhelm was always desperate to fit in, to be one of the boys, especially among British society. He loved his father despite his liberalism, hated his English mother, adored his grandmother Queen Victoria and hated her son the future Edward VII. He regularly stated that he was half English, ignoring the fact that the British Royal Family was probably more German than the Hohenzollerns.

Bismarck underestimated the new Kaiser. He expected Wilhelm II to be content to reign not rule. Wilhelm wanted to rule and not merely as a constitutional monarch. One of his fondest memories was reading one of his father's books which glorified the Holy Roman Empire. Wilhelm wanted the sort of power that the old emperors had and was unwilling to be restricted by a minor inconvenience like a constitution. To do this he needed to be surrounded, not by old men with minds of their own, but by people willing to follow his lead. Thus Bismarck's time was limited. The trouble was that neither Wilhelm nor the men who surrounded him were in any way Bismarck's equal.

Within days of Bismarck's resignation, Herbert von Bismarck had resigned as State Secretary for Foreign Affairs, leaving a foreign affairs vacuum just days before the

Reinsurance Treaty was to be renewed. General George von Caprivi was made Chancellor, while Baron Alfred Marschall von Bieberstein became Foreign Minister. Neither had any diplomatic experience. The man with diplomatic experience was Freiderich von Holstein, a professional diplomat who had been a "loyal" advisor to the Bismarcks. The Kaiser had told the Russian ambassador that Germany's foreign policy would not change with Bismarck's fall and that the treaty would be renewed. However Holstein had opposed the agreement, seeing Russia as a threat even as an ally. He showed the treaty to Caprivi, who asked for Holstein's opinion. Holstein advised letting the treaty lapse. If Austria learned of the treaty it would harm relations with her, and Holstein felt that Germany needed Austria as a balance to Russia. Caprivi then advised the Kaiser to let the treaty lapse, and Wilhelm, failing to mention his pledge to renew the treaty, agreed. When Caprivi learned of the Kaiser's promise he threatened to resign. Wilhelm had no choice but to give up the Russian treaty since he didn't dare lose a second chancellor within a week. The decision made domestic sense, but it gave France the perfect opportunity to end her isolation. Within three years Russia joined France in an alliance. Germany had gone from being the encircler to being the encircled.

Under Bismarck, Germany's relations with the British were basically good, largely because their interests did not conflict. Germany had a small colonial empire and her growing overseas trade was protected by British warships. On the other hand Britain had virtually no involvement in Europe. Although he offered to enter into a treaty with Britain on at least one occasion, Bismarck understood Britain's isolationism and that their primary concern was the colonial empire. Bismarck once commented that "An English attack would only be thinkable if we found ourselves at war with Russia and France, or did anything so utterly absurd as to fall upon Holland or Belgium or block the Baltic by blocking the sound." Bismarck wasn't about to do anything absurd, and his efforts were directed at avoiding a two front war with Russia and France. Indeed by encouraging the colonial ambitions of France and Russia, Germany could be sure that Britain would never enter into an alliance with them, while colonial confrontations could distract French attention from Alsace-Lorraine.

With Bismarck's fall two developments, extensions of each other, would worsen relations and eventually lead to exactly what the German's didn't want, a cooling of the antagonism between Britain, France, and Russia. The first of these developments was adoption of the policy of *Weltpolitik*, or world power, in 1890. After unification Germany was an industrial powerhouse. By 1914 they produced as much coal and twice as much steel as the British and had the second largest merchant fleet in the world. To proponents of *Weltpolitik* this wasn't enough. Germany had to expand overseas, and neither the fact that Germany's existing colonies were unprofitable nor that most of the world had been colonized mattered. Germany began taking an

aggressive interest in colonial affairs between 1896 and 1914. Such a policy also required a navy.

A navy had never played a major part of Bismarck's plans. Germany's enemies were continental, so while there may have been naval engagements they would not be decisive. The only power against which a naval battle would be crucial was Britain with whom Bismarck was careful to maintain good relations. Thus, under Bismarck the German Navy was primarily a defensive force capable of offensive action against either France or Russia, but not a challenge to the British.

Wilhelm's position on the navy was entirely different. A combination of admiration and jealousy towards Britain led him to want "as fine a navy as the English." He was also influenced by the writings of Alfred T. Mahan, which were becoming popular at the time. Mahan's theory could be reduced to the belief that to be a world power you must first have sea power. And a major tenet of German national policy was *Weltpolitik*, world power. The type of ships needed to achieve this was subject to debate. Wilhelm wanted cruisers for commerce raiding but Admiral Tirpitz, chief of the Naval High Command wanted battleships. Tirpitz presented his views to the Kaiser in an 1897 memorandum: Germany's principle naval enemy was Britain and only the main theater of war was important. Germany didn't have the overseas bases to sustain commerce raiding. Tirpitz stated that a fleet of seventeen battleships would make Germany a force to contend with: "Even the greatest sea state in Europe would be more conciliatory towards us if we were able to throw two or three highly trained squadrons into the political scales." To respond to British superiority Tirpitz developed his famous Risk Theory. The idea was simple: in a war with Britain the German navy might be beaten but the British fleet would suffer such losses that other powers would inevitably attack them. Thus a strong German navy would force the British to make an agreement with Germany. The difficulty was how to become strong enough to avoid a pre-emptive strike. As both sides built more ships, and newer classes of ships, the point where such an attack would cease to be a danger moved further into the future.

It is interesting to speculate on what might have happened had Germany not tried to build a fleet to challenge Britain. As it was, although Tirpitz would never have admitted it, his Risk Theory failed. The key assumption had been that by building a powerful fleet Germany could force Britain to make an agreement with them. The British made approaches, but at the time the Germans wanted too much: Britain would have to become a full member of the Triple Alliance with Germany, Austria, and Italy. The Germans were content to wait for the British to come on bended knee, acknowledging Germany as superior. Instead Britain resolved its differences with France and Russia. With that the assumptions underpinning "Risk Theory" were negated.

Once Britain reached an agreement with France, the aim of German diplomacy shifted to destroying that relationship. Belatedly Bismarck's successors recognized the importance of keeping France isolated. Unfortunately they lacked clear objectives and usually over reached what they could reasonably hope to achieve.

The first major opportunity was the Moroccan Crisis of 1905. Under the Anglo French Entente, France was granted dominance over Morocco. At the time German Chancellor Helmut von Bulow agreed with the provision as a way to restore order in Morocco. When two Americans were kidnapped by a Moroccan chieftain in 1904 the French took the opportunity to demand that the Sultan turn control of his army, police, and customs service over to them. The Sultan appealed for help to the German government. Bulow and Holstein seized on the situation as a way to destroy the Anglo-French agreement, and force French Foreign Minister Theophile Delcasse from office. The timing was ideal for brinkmanship: Russia was entangled with Japan, the British army was weak, and France was unprepared for war. The German position would officially be support of treaty rights and an open door policy. This was emphasized by a rather farcical visit by the Kaiser to Tangier and in the German demand for a international conference on Morocco. The crisis seemed to be producing the desired results when Delcasse resigned from office under fire from both sides of the National Assembly and from within the French Cabinet. When the Kaiser learned of this he made Bulow a Prince. However the Germans wanted more. French Premier Maurice Rouvier, acting as his own Foreign Minister, assumed that the situation would calm down with Delcasse gone. Instead he found the Germans unyielding and the British unhappy over the French failure to support Delcasse. With Germany threatening war, Rouvier gave in and accepted a conference on Morocco in the Spanish city of Algeciras. The result was scarcely the triumph Bulow and Holstein hoped for. Instead of breaking the Entente Cordiale, German bullying at the conference strengthened it, as Britain repeatedly supported the French position. Holstein was removed as a result of the diplomatic debacle, and Bulow was forced out as Chancellor in 1909.

By 1911 Germany had recognized France's "special political interests" in Morocco in return for French promises not to obstruct German commercial interests there. However the French refused German mining companies permission to operate in southern Morocco, which was closed to international commerce under the Algeciras agreement. When a rebellion began against the new Sultan, Germany took the opportunity to pressure the French. The Algeciras agreement allowed countries to intervene in Morocco to protect their nationals. The German navy was instructed to send a gunboat, the Panther to the port of Agadir in southern Morocco to protect German citizens. First a German citizen had to be sent to Agadir to be "saved", since there were no Germans living there. Once he arrived, sailors from the Panther and the cruiser Berlin moved to protect the

"endangered German". Although the intention was to pressure the French, the British were increasingly worried that Germany wanted to establish a permanent base along a vital sea lane. The British were prepared to go to war over this, however the Germans managed to reduce tensions with Britain by explaining the Franco-German nature of the crisis. British pressure eased off, but British support gave the French a greater will to resist German demands.

One problem was that Germany's objectives in this confrontation were never clear. German Foreign Minister Kiderlen maintained a studied silence in public, hoping to increase the pressure on France. This led nationalistic German opinion to expect great things, including a partition of Morocco and humiliation of the French. Kiderlen did make major territorial demands, which were rejected by France. He eventually reduced his demands while the French increased their offers. When an agreement ceding 100,000 square miles of the French Congo to the German colony of Cameroon (less than half Kiderlen's "irreducible minimum") was finally reached, it was clear that for all he had risked Kiderlen had accomplished nothing. The British Foreign Minister, Sir Edward Grey, described it as "almost a fiasco for Germany: out of this mountain of German-made crisis came a mouse of colonial territory in Africa."

The policy of brinkmanship reached its inevitable climax with the Balkan Crisis of July 1914, the roots of which lay in the annexation of Bosnia-Hercegovina by Austria in 1908. At that time the German government had been prepared to support Austria to the point of war, even though the Kaiser described the Austria move as "a piece of brigandage". The Russian government was forced to accept the Austrian action and the resultant loss of face in the Balkans without gains of their own. Thereafter Russia policy was to actively contest any challenge over the Balkans. At the time the Tsar said that "German action towards us has been simply brutal and we won't stand for it." Thus, as a result of Germany's role in the crisis there was a significant cooling in relations between Russia and Germany even though the Kaiser considered the Tsar - his cousin Nikky - to be his dearest friend.

Of course the Germans had little choice. Although their Ambassador in Vienna, Count Tschirshky wrote in 1914, "I constantly wonder whether it really pays to bind ourselves so tightly to this phantasm of a state which is cracking in every direction", the truth was that Austria-Hungary was Germany's one reliable ally. For their part Austria-Hungary could do nothing internationally without German help, but the government was willing to take chances because they knew Germany would support them.

Things flashed into a crisis with the assassination of the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The plot had been supported by elements within the Serbian government, but Franz Ferdinand's death evoked general sympathy for Austria-Hungary from the international

community. For Hawks within the Austrian and German governments it seemed an ideal opportunity. On the advice of his ministers, Wilhelm offered Austria-Hungary support for whatever action they took including war, assuming that Russia would not fight. Having approved the offer, the Kaiser went on a summer cruise along the Norwegian fjords, leaving management of the crisis to his Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg and State Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Gottlieb von Jagow.

They apparently felt that it was just as well that the Kaiser was away. They worried that the crisis couldn't be managed with the Kaiser interfering. Their expectations for this confrontation were great: the destruction of Serbia, the restoration of Austria-Hungary as a Great Power, and the reduction of Russia's status. The Germans wanted swift action, but the Austrians were intent on crafting a set of demands which, they believed, Serbia could not possibly accept thereby justifying war. Astonishingly the Serbs accepted nine out of the ten Austrian demands. The Kaiser, who returned to Berlin the day that the response was received, declared it a "great moral victory for Vienna", and ordered Bethmann-Hollweg to offer Germany as a mediator. The Chancellor ignored the Kaiser's instructions. On July 29, Austria began shelling Belgrade.

Even as the bombardment began, Bethmann-Hollweg was worrying about world opinion. He contacted the Austrian government several times demanding, even begging them to restrict their actions and to accept mediation. After that, if Russia declared war the blame would fall on them. Austria refused all entreaties. The Chancellor wasn't the only one trying to slow the Juggernaut. The Kaiser wrote numerous letters to Tsar Nicholas, trying alternately to bully and persuade him not to mobilize. The problem was that within Germany the Generals were anxious for war. Helmut von Moltke, chief of the General Staff, even went behind the back of the Kaiser and the Chancellor to tell his Austrian counterpart to begin full mobilization, promising that Germany would follow. On July 30, the Austrians began full mobilization. This was followed the same day by a Russian mobilization order. When word of this reached the

German Foreign Office the next day, only one course seemed to exist. Ultimatums were sent to St. Petersburg demanding a halt to mobilization, and to Paris demanding that France declare its neutrality and turn over certain fortresses to Germany as a guarantee. At noon on August 1 the ultimatum to Russia expired. Wilhelm ordered general mobilization.

And there of course was the final, sickening, fatal irony. Even if France declared their neutrality, nothing could be done. The vaunted German General Staff had only one mobilization plan and that was to hurl the bulk of Germany's 51 regular infantry divisions and 31 reserve divisions at France through Belgium. No one believed that there would be a war in which France would not be the main enemy. When Kaiser Wilhelm, in a frantic effort to keep the war from widening, tried to stop German forces from entering Luxembourg, Moltke told him "Your Majesty it cannot be done. The deployment of millions cannot be improvised....These arrangements took a whole year of intricate labor to complete and once settled they cannot be altered." So war with France was preordained, and because the Schlieffen plan insisted on doing what Bismarck had called "utterly absurd", invading Belgium, Germany also found herself at war with Britain.

In looking at German history leading up to the start of World War I, the importance of Bismarck's firing cannot be over emphasized. Bismarck played Diplomacy on the "real" board, shifting his policies based on the situation at the time. Bismarck would never have clung to the Austrian alliance long after it had ceased to be useful, although he might have let the Austrians think he had. Bismarck's successors failed in exactly the areas where he had succeeded, by being inflexible in their planning and expecting things to go their way just because they wanted them to. In relations with Britain they tried to scare the British into being their friends. Instead of being conciliatory they bullied. Their failure should be a lesson to Diplomacy players.

*{Brent McKee publishes the popular Canadian Dip zine Making Love in a Canoe.}*

---

## Diplomatic Schizophrenia

by David Partridge

A year or so back I had the opportunity to play test a variant designed by Tim Snyder and Jamie Drier. The variant, called Juggernaut, plays just like regular Diplomacy, except for the fact that there are only six players and one of the players secretly controls two powers. The game was played on the Internet using the Judge software so that individual press to each power was possible as everything was rerouted through a central computer and no names were ever revealed, however it could easily be played as postal

Gunboat. The victory conditions were either a solo 18 center win by any power, or a combined 24 center win by the two Juggernaut powers.

I was lucky enough to be given the Juggernaut, playing Austria and Russia. Hiding the actual Juggernaut powers seemed like the most important issue, so I decided to try and forge strong, long term alliances for each power as soon as possible. The other players would all fear the Juggernaut



and find a strong alliance attractive, and these alliances would appear as obvious choices for the Juggernaut to the rest of the players. The Italian player was friendly and wrote good press but did not put forward a lot of strategic suggestions and seemed quite willing to follow my lead, so the Austrian player became a loud and boisterous player, participating a lot in the press, sending lots of messages and generally taking the lead in the A/I alliance. The German player was a quiet, terse player who seemed very strong tactically, so the Russian became a quiet follower type who was more than willing to get most of his moves from his German ally and rarely had a suggestion of his own.

These two alliances quickly became dominant, reducing the remaining three powers to a few centers at best, and both Italy and Germany were certain that the other alliance represented the Juggernaut. When the time came to make my move, Russia stabbed Germany viciously while the A/I alliance continued to hold together, maintaining a seesawing balance on the Russian front and continuing to press Germany. Based on the play of Russia throughout, the poorly thought out justifications he gave Germany for the stab, and some "mistakes" in the battle in the south, Germany continued to be convinced that Russia was acting alone, that A/I was probably the Juggernaut and that Russia was just being short sighted and foolish. He refused any advances by Italy, seeing them as a ruse of the Juggernaut and berated Russia for his stupidity. A sudden series of "lucky guesses" led to the collapse of the Austrian front and an 18 center Russian win. To the last, Germany never held a belief that Russia was part of the Juggernaut, and Italy had only a few suspicions.

Now, to the point of this story (yes, there is a point, actually two.) First is that this is a fun variant and well worth trying. Second is that the methods that seem so obvious when playing as the Juggernaut can be applied equally well, to standard Diplomacy. Diplomacy is a game of psychology, and, although not literally as in Juggernaut, each player represents more than one power. If you are playing France, you are not just the glorious reincarnation of Napoleon heading inexorably towards your justified dominance of Europe as you picture yourself. You are also the despicable backstabber who violated the truce and grabbed Belgium, as seen by the German, and the currently peaceful neighbor who's growth is causing some concerns as viewed by Italy, the steadfast ally as viewed by England, and a potential partner against the treacherous Italian as viewed by the struggling Austrian. The face you present to each of these players should not be the same. Is your English ally an open and forthright type who seems to believe in game long alliances and trust between partners? Then certainly an open and trusting partnership is going to go over better than an armed truce alliance. Yet I have seen many honest and sincere partners suddenly stabbed by their allies. Not so much because the stab made good tactical or strategic sense, but because the other player "knew" his ally was up to something. A three way alliance I

was in recently broke up when one of the players stabbed both the other players in conjunction with the powers we were fighting. While this effectively destroyed the alliance, it also led to the destruction of the stabber as he was crushed between his former allies. When asked why he had done it given how likely his destruction was, he said that he had to, because he knew that we were planning to stab him. After all, neither of us had even raised the idea of stabbing the other with him, so obviously we were planning together to stab him! The trustworthy and open face I had presented to partner one was certainly not the correct choice for partner two. Had I seemed wary and distrustful with him, insisting on frequent confirmations of the alliance and carefully negotiated balancing of our forces the alliance probably would have held together long enough to crush the opposing coalition.

The thing to remember about Diplomacy is that it is only partially a game of strategy and tactics. Each player is a potential ally and a potential enemy. A brilliant plan is not enough if the ally you need simply decides he doesn't want to be a part of it. Those opening letters are more than just a means of determining which of a set of stock openings you are going to choose. They are the way you form an opinion about the character of the other players, and most importantly, the way they form an opinion about you. Long rambling letters to the serious, stick to business strategist are not going to endear you or advance your position, nor are strident calls for revenge or long tactical analyses going to charm the player who's out for a romp and couldn't care less about a win. Remember, there are six other players out there, and they probably represent a broad enough range for you to write any kind of letter you want and receive a positive response. Not only is it good strategy to treat each player as an individual and adapt the face you present to them, it's likely to be more fun, and that is what the game is really about. Have a long tactical discussion with Sue, spend several pages talking about the ski conditions with Paul and suddenly remember to suggest a move in the postscript. You'll find that not only will your alliances last longer and your suggestions be better received, but you'll look forward to those letters more and start to develop friendships that go beyond the game you are in, and that's what makes this a hobby, not just a never ending tournament.

*{If you want to see David's name elsewhere in this issue, check out the Demo Game where he is playing Austria.}*





# Diplomacy World History - A Look at Issue #4

by David Hood

One asset the Diplomacy hobby has that is currently under-utilized is the vast storehouse of information in past issues of Diplomacy World. After all, a zine that has been published more or less continuously since 1974 ought to have a few things that would be of interest to Diplomacy hobbyists today. Since I have a DW archive of sorts, I thought I would showcase some past issues for readers of the current DW (some of whom were probably not even born when these issues were published!)

The first DW editor was Walter Buchanan, who started the zine as an expansion of his earlier Hoosier Archives. HA was mainly a vehicle for the publication of Demo Games, a DW mainstay that has continued to this day. (Indeed, you can get a DW Anthology that is devoted solely to looking at past Demo Games to learn from the "past masters." Contact Larry Peery, 6103 Malcolm Drive, San Diego, CA 92115 for more info...)

Issue 4 had several features that make it important in hobby history. For one thing, its cover, reproduced on the following page, has become one of the most popular Diplomacy cartoons ever, and has graced the covers of other zines, including that of the German zine The Diplomat, published by Thomas Franke. In the early years, there were several Dip cartoonists who published their work in DW. On into the 1980's, the quality of the artwork improved even more with the regular publication of the Dippy Doodles by J.R. Baker.

One contest in the first few issues of DW was the Great Lagerson Diplomatic Excuse Contest. The trick was to come up with the most involved and/or effective excuse to be used with one's spouse when coming home late from a FTF game. This issue Dennis Klein submission, wherein he said "To set a few things straight, I have never come home late from a face-to-face game, so I was never pressed to have an excuse for my tardiness." But he went on to try his best anyway: "The best way to soft soap the light of your life is not with a dozen flowers or some other outlandish item or event, but by just relieving some of the tension and pressure of her daily routine."

Uh, Dennis, my experience is that you had better do both!

The world of J.R.R. Tolkien has been the inspiration for a number of Diplomacy variants over the years. The most prevalent of these has been Downfall of the Lord of the Rings, currently being run in such places as Pete Sullivan's The Octopus' Garden. Issue 4 of DW had the listing for the first version of this variant, by Harley Patterson. The basic problem with Tolkien's world is that a multiplayer game that is balanced is next to impossible if you have a Mordor player, so Downfall involved having two basic "sides" with

some other powers (like Umbar and the Dwarves) who were neutral. I believe there may be some openings for this variant now in Tom Howell's zine off-the-shelf.

One thing the postal hobby no longer has is a well-publicized ratings system for postal players. The latest attempt at such a thing was done by Buz Eddy, but it suffered from a lack of promotion and cooperation from others. It is of no small importance that we have no overall way to pat people on the back for good play of our game, like those in the Chess and Bridge hobbies have, for example. (For that matter, the Hall of Fame listing in Email play does satisfy this need to some degree.)

At any rate, in DW issue 4 there was a current listing of the Brobdingnag Rating List, compiled by Jeff Power. This was a compilation of postal finishes wherein a player received one point from every player doing worse than he, and gave one point to players with better finishes. Performance was scored in descending order from win, draw, survival according to supply centers, and elimination by year. (This is really the way most scoring systems work - they just vary the relative weights between a win and a draw, for example). The only person on the top two boards that is currently active in the Diplomacy world today is Fred Davis, who is retired from actually playing postal games. I know that 1974 was a long time ago, but the only others on that list in the top hundred or so that are still at it are Mark Murray, Gene Prosnitz, Edi Birsan, and Larry Peery.

There are also fewer variants played now than there used to be, even ten years ago. The openings you see now are mainly for Gunboat and Colonial Diplomacy. In DW 4, there was a lot of variant material, including a new variant called Earthsea Diplomacy, by Thomas Galloway. This was a variant based upon the fantasy trilogy by Ursula K. LeGuin. It is a map full of islands, so fleets are obviously much more important than in the regular game. Lew Pulsipher, the longtime DW variants guy and overall Variant designer and promoter, featured this variant while also listing such widely divergent titles as War of the Roses and Random Paralysis Diplomacy. Other items of note include Hyborian Age Diplomacy I by Gary Gygax, who was as you know the designer of Dungeons and Dragons, and an early and active member of the Diplomacy hobby. Also listed was Algernon Diplomacy, by Thomas Galloway, where the players explore the map as they expand, sort of like those Railway Rivals variants.


Strategy & Tactics fans are very well aware of the Lepanto Opening, which is the name for a certain set of opening moves wherein Italy attacks Turkey by landing an army in Syria in Fall 1902. In 1974, this was a very nouveau strategy, having just been developed by Edi Birsan during

1972. There was an article about the Lepanto in this issue, by Len Lakofka. Strangely, though, there was no other S&T material in the issue apart from Demo Game commentary.

Overall, the issue was 32 pages long. There were 11 articles, plus other material including hobby news and game openings information. The zine was nicely layed-out for the pre-computer era, and was sent by bulk mail. (Nowadays that is practically impossible, as I found out during my stint as DW editor six years ago). If you have an interest in hobby history, or if you just want to see what these people had to say about the game back then, you can find back issues a variety of places. For issues before #60, contact Larry Peery to see what he's got. After that, you can contact me (2905 20th St. NE, Hickory, NC 28601). A better way to see old material is to get a DW anthology from Larry. There are several of these: Best of DW, Best of Mark Berch, Variants, Demo Games, etc. Contact him for more info.

In future articles I will either review past issues of DW as I have done here, or I will extract material from past issues on particular subjects, like French openings or ratings systems, or whatever. If you have any ideas or interests in this regard, please contact me.

*{David Hood is a former editor of both Diplomacy World and Carolina Command & Commentary.}*



VOL. 1, NO. 4

JUL - AUG 1974

## The Endgame in Diplomacy: An Electronic Conversation

by Mark Nelson

### (1) Introduction

This is a summary of an electronic discussion of the endgame in diplomacy. The contributors were Mark Nelson (amt5man@amsta.leeds.ac.uk), Douglas Van Belle (dvpo@uno.edu) and Dan Shoham (shoham@hnc.com).

The discussion started when rec.games.diplomacy reader stated that they were interested in improving their endgame play and wondered if it would be possible to design a variant where the game started in an interesting endgame. The simple answer is, if you want to improve your endgame play then look at the list of games which need replacement players and join any which are in the endgame!

### (2) Are Endgame Boring?

In response to the idea of an endgame-variant Douglas commented that the endgame in diplomacy can often be boring. Dan's response was immediate

"End games are far from boring. Some of the best tactical

plays come out at end games. Once the alliances and battle lines are drawn out clearly, the good tactician finally has enough information to work with and bring home the victory."

Are endgames boring? Far from it, they can be intellectually stimulating. Once the alliances have set the leader usually has a secured set of centers and can readily identify the centers needed to win. In such circumstances it is often possible to analyze the position several years ahead, because it is easy to identify correct tactical play, and to determine what the optimal strategy is to win the game.

However, if the good tactician "has enough information to work with and bring home the victory" the position is, by de facto definition, boring! An 'interesting endgames' is a position where the leaders units are scattered across the board, amongst those of the defending side. In these positions the leader not only has to concentrate on securing centers, he has to concentrate on avoiding the loss of centers. Such positions are considerable rarer than the 'boring positions'.

(3) What happens in the endgame when three players remain?

Douglas mentioned that he has some research which "seems to indicate that once the game gets down to three players it almost always ends in a draw. Four players much less often."

He went on to comment that "Wins seem to come the most when there are five players or more on the board just a few moves before the end" and that this phenomenon "fits very well with a formal theoretic analysis of anarchic systems."

I do not have any stats to hand about the state of the board just prior to the end of the game. However I do have stats on the number of eliminated players in games which finished in a win. In my database of 260 internet games, 105 finished in a win and 68 in a three-way draw.

In analyzing this data a few approximations were made. First of all I assumed that the games were DIAS. This is not as unreasonable as it seems because my dataset is for games played according to the Electronic Protocol houserules which specified that games should be DIAS. Of the games which finished in a win 14 were concessions rather than rule-book wins. In including these games in my dataset I am assuming that if these games had continued to completion the number of eliminated players would have remained the same. This is not too unreasonable because in six of the games the winning player had 17 centers and in four of them the winning player had 16 centers. As shown in Table One in most rule-book victories the winner has 18 or 19 centers. In most cases moving from 16/17 centers to 18/19 centers would not result in the elimination of an additional player. Therefore for simplicity I include the data from games which ended in a concession.

# Centers	# Frequency	% Frequency
18	57	62.6
19	25	27.5
20	5	5.5
21	3	3.3
22	1	1.1

Table One. The number of centers owned by the winning player in Electronic Protocol games which finished in a rule-book victory.

The number of eliminations in games which finished in a win are shown in Table Two. Note that there were three or four players remaining at the end of the game in a significant majority of the games finishing in a win. Although this does not tell us how many players there were remaining "a few moves before the end" (is it possible to define this in a more rigorous manner?) it does suggest that Douglas is right with his comment that "Wins seem to come the most often when there are five players or more on the board just a few moves before the end."

Dan provided some opposing stats by examining 10 Judge games which finished in a dan-win. This showed that "Only 2 of them had 5 or more players within a year of the victory. If we ignore 1-2 SC powers, than none of the 10 had 5 or more powers within 2 years (up to 10 turns) of victory." This could be a reflection of the fact that these were games which Dan had won, and not a reflection of non-dan games.

# Eliminations	Sample Size	Percentage
1	6 (5)	5.7 (5.5)
2	17 (13)	16.2 (14.3)
3	40 (37)	38.1 (40.7)
4	37 (31)	35.2 (34.1)
5	5 (5)	4.8 (5.5)

Table Two. The number of eliminatees in games which finished in a win. The bracketed figures refer to the corresponding figures for a game which ended in a rulebook win.

In response to Douglas' post Dan commented that "Given that most wins pass through a point where there are only 3 players left, it follows that it is untrue that once the game gets down to three players it almost always ends in a draw."

Examining Table Two we observe that only 40% of rulebook wins passed through a point where there are 3, or fewer, players left. These games comprise 13.85% of the database (260 games). Recall that three-way draws comprise 26.15% of the database.

Assuming that all the games were DIAS we conclude that games which reach a stage where there are only three players remaining (assuming that all games which finished with two players remaining passed through a stage when three players remained) are twice as likely to finish in a 3-WAY DRAW than a win.

In addition note that games which pass through a stage in which there are three, or fewer, players remaining can finish in a two-way draw, in addition to win and three-way draw; there were 39 two-way draws in my database.

Based on these numbers once a game reaches a stage where there are three players remaining (assuming for simplicity that all games which finished with only two players remaining passed through a stage where there were three players remaining) the probability that a game finishes in a win is 25.17%, that it finishes in a two-way draw is 27.27% and that it finishes in a 3-way draw are 47.55%. So the probability that once the game gets down to three players it finishes in a draw is 74.82%.

Of course these figures are derived making a DIAS assumption and by examining the number of eliminatees at the end of the game. Douglas comments that there is a

significant difference in examining the number of players remaining at the end of the game and the number remaining the year before the game was won. "It is significant for, in theory, the concern is the decision making context prior to the end which would be the year before the game was won."

Clearly there is scope here for a more in-depth analysis of diplomacy game results.

*{Mark Nelson is/was/will be the publisher of a large number of Dip zines. He is also the DW Electronic Mail editor, and a Crazie kinda guy.}*

## Knives and Daggers - The Diplomacy World Letter Column

**Michael Mingus** - I got my recent issue. Great as always. I like the Demo Game and some of the articles. One suggestion: in past issues a page was dedicated to a schedule of future cons, which was absent this time. I know a whole page takes up alot of space, so maybe a half page listing cons in the next 4 to 6 months. That gives plenty of time to schedule airline plans, etc.


**Paul Milewski** - As before, our hobby is looking at numerical data without testing it for statistical significance. Only for purposes of demonstrating my point, and not wishing to single out Melinda Holley for criticism, let me cite as an example some data from Melinda Holley's "7 X 7 Gunboat Tournaments - An Analysis" (Diplomacy World #76, pp. 6-15).

We have data from 12 round-robin gunboat tournaments in which a particular country is either eliminated or it is not. What can we conclude from that? If you toss an honest coin 100 times, it is unlikely you will get a fifty-fifty distribution of heads and tails. Even if each of the seven countries has an equal probability of being eliminated, it is unlikely that in any 84 games each country will be eliminated the same number of times as every other country. The idea is to determine how unlikely it is to obtain results such as those you have obtained from a population (an unlimited number of games) in which each country dies have an equal probability of being eliminated. If your results would be extremely rare viewed as a sample from such an indefinitely large population, you reject the notion that the probability of elimination is the same for all countries. That is called testing the null hypothesis. The conclusion that France is less likely to be eliminated than the others is wholly unjustified without a statistical test. *{Paul then provides a statistical test of this conclusion, which is available from me for a SASE. His final determination is that the chance of obtaining these results if France is as likely to be eliminated as the other six countries is less than one in a thousand.}*

Having validated that conclusion of hers, the reader should be cautioned that all her conclusions should be tested in a similar manner. Since they have not been, you accept any of her conclusions at your peril. I'm glad Melinda's article gives me somebody's conclusions other than Mark Nelson's to pick apart for a change. That last article he published in Everything #92 was almost irresistible.

**Bjorn von Knorring** - I want to reply to Tim Hoyt: It was a quite interesting article, and I read with great interest. Mr. Hoyt has discovered that two countries who cooperate to 100% get great advantages... It can never be said too often; two (or more) players who trust each other completely always have the edge, regardless which countries they play. I would guess that if I would have played on the table Mr. Hoyt was talking about I would have been both astonished by the clever moves and would (probably) have had quite a boring time. These get me to my point with all this (and it is NOT directed towards Mr. Hoyt) which is this; when to stab and when to stay in an alliance? We have had quite long discussions about this in Sweden and in general we have gotten to the conclusion that you always should do what is best for your country. If that means to stab your best friend/long alliance partner so be it. Of course such things as revenge always are part of the picture but I have never seen two Swedish Diplomacy players shouting at each other because of a game. This style of playing also means that you always should take a solo victory if you get the chance. I have only seen it happen once at a Swedish con that someone did not take 18 when he could (and that was at a final table with very special circumstances). As far I as know I think that this is something that is lively debated in the U.S. and that it quite often happens that two friends ally as soon as they get in the same game. Am I correct or have I misunderstood something? This is a topic that really concerns me and if anyone will reply to what I have said or my way of playing I will be happy to reply. Short summary: Always stab when you gain more from it than stay in the alliance. Never ally with your friends (if that is the only base for your alliance). Take a solo victory if you get the chance. Always be gentle against the other players. It is a game, right?

*{To you it is just a game...to me it is a way of life! Mooohahahahahaha!}*



# Demonstration "Railway Rivals" Game (1064CT)

Results for Rounds 4 and 5

January 27, 1996

If you're just joining us, a word of explanation. This feature is meant to explain the game "Railway Rivals" to those who have never played. Follow the results and commentary, and you may decide to sign up for a game yourself. We "Rivals" fans would love to have you! If you have questions, please send them to me (Eric Brosius, 41 Hayward St., Milford MA 01757.) "Railway Rivals" is invented and marketed by David Watts ("Rostherne", 102 Priory Rd., Milford Haven, Dyfed UK SA73 2ED,) and is played in many zines.

**Comments before Round 4.** These comments are based on the game board as it appeared after Round 3 (see *Diplomacy World* 76.) The die rolls for Round 4 were 3-2-6. Read the comments, look at the map, and guess along with the players. Enjoy!

**Steve Courtemanche.** I'd give the nod in the early going to COX for having very straight lines going E-W. Others will have to cross over his lines to prevent him from having too many solo runs. To this end, ARNE is positioned nicely as COX's major rival. Continued preying by the above two on each other's territory will allow DULL to rack in the dough from people riding his line for cities in the southwest. WLLS is proving to be a spoiler for position but seems to have no focus and will not place well because of wasted track lay.

**Tony Robbins.** It was kind of Jim to build to Hitchin for me—that'll save some time; also kind of him not to build to Luton, which would have made it more interesting for me. So I must build to Luton, Dunstable and Linslade—opening up more possibilities, as well as a link with Conrad.

Dunstable-Linslade: a good example of a perennial RR problem—via which hexes? In this case, building via D56 gives the option of a NE-SW line via Aylesbury and Princes Risborough as well as Linslade-Bicester. ((It also involves more risk of a payment to ARNE, but Tony takes the chance in order to get a better-placed line.)) I'm not too sure where Mike will build this time, so I'll get C19-C21 in before it costs too much.

**Mike Morris.** This turn I decided to go for the remaining cities. It is not good to go for city points alone. However, when cities also extend your line in useful areas, and when the game is close, as this one is, it may well be worth it. I don't have a line to any of the "40s" cities yet, so Bicester and Buckingham do give me useful connections, and Buckingham is also a special run hex, and so another race location. Blue is very close behind me, and he is my competitor for these cities, so that is an added incentive. I don't think I'll be first to Buckingham, ((he was!)) but it does help my line and is worth the gamble.

Didcot I need not only for the points, but also to try to slow down DULL in his build east. If he goes straight for the western edge this turn I can't stop him, but if he builds only partially west, as is likely, my line in Didcot will give him some pause on later builds.

**James Goode.** I fear that I've abandoned my original strategy—and am being hurt by it. I predicted that all rivals would start by building SE-NW lines. Then Tony and I started competing SW-NE. I feel that I *must* build a line to the NW soon. The longer I delay that build, the farther I lag behind.

**Conrad von Metzke.** So far, fairly good—four very attractive lines. Mine needs an extension to Oxford and B41 to complete the main route, but that's easy.

My suspicion after Round 4 is this: All three rivals will try moving into the NW. If so, I predict Tony's southern line will win the game. Too bad Mike didn't try that as well; it would have helped both of us.

**Eric Brosius (GM).** Now it's time to read the Round 4 report on the next page and follow along on the map. I'll comment briefly on the strategy as it relates to the races that will be run starting in Round 7.

Let's look at some of Mike Morris's comments. As is usual in postal games, I will "sector" the races; that is, there will be two races from each sector to each other sector. (A *sector* is a group of six towns with the same first digit—for instance, the "40s"—with the special runs making up a seventh sector.) There can be no race from Abingdon (Town 21) to Thame (Town 25,) for example, since both are in the same sector, but there will be two races from the "20s" to the "40s". By building a line to Bicester and Buckingham, Mike gives himself a chance to win some of these races.

Pay close attention also to Mike's comment that he built to Didcot to discourage DULL from building in that direction. As a beginner, you may believe that it is an advantage to have a rival build into your area because the rival may be forced to pay you for junctions and parallels. In practice, it is better to remain isolated so you can dominate races to the area. Sometimes it pays to build track so that it will not be worth a rival's while to build into your "back yard." In this case, as we will see, Tony built to Didcot anyway during Round 5, so Mike's build was not enough to discourage Tony, who will now give Mike competition on races from the SE to the Oxford area.

**Just two towns left without rail service!**

Red—Dunstable, Umfolozi & Luton Lines (DULL)

Tony Robbins—Lincoln House, Creaton Rd., Hollowell, Northants, UK NN6 8RP [tony.robbs@brookes.ac.uk](mailto:tony.robbs@brookes.ac.uk)

- 4a: (B61)—\*Luton\*—D59.
- 4b: (D59)—\*Dunstable\*—D57.
- 4c: (D57)—D56—E56—Linslade; (C19)—C21; (Reading)—B8. [ 1→COX | C19 ]

Orange—Chilterns Overland Express (COX)

Mike Morris—23693 Glenbrook Lane, Hayward CA 94541 71340.370@compuserve.com

- 4a: (Oxford)—C45.
- 4b: (C45)—\*\*Bicester\*\*.
- 4c: (J2)—\*Didcot\*; (Bicester)—H47—\*Buckingham\*.

Lime Green—Will Lloyds of London Survive? (WLLS)

James Goode—211 Maplemere, Clarksville TN 37040 [goodej@lynx.apsu.edu](mailto:goodej@lynx.apsu.edu)

- 4a: (N16)—A56—A54. [ 1→ARNE | A54 ]
- 4b: (D64)—\*Stevenage\*; (A54)—Aylesbury.
- 4c: (Aylesbury)—Princes Risborough; (E15)—D14. [ 1→ARNE | N12 ]

Blue—[tune to "Hail Britannia"] (ARNE) Conrad von Metzke—4374 Donald Ave., San Diego CA 92117

- 4a: (B49)—E48.
- 4b: (E48)—\*\*Bicester\*\*.
- 4c: (D55)—Dunstable; (G22)—J23. [ 4→DULL | D56→Dunstable, 1+1→DULL & WLLS | H22 ]

Financials.	Line	Start	Cities	Payments	Finish
	COX	59	+15	—, +1	75
	DULL	51	+12	—1, +5	67
	ARNE	57	+3	—6, +2	56
	WLLS	33	+6	—2, +1	38

**Press!**

WLLS: What is the correct pronunciation of "Aylesbury"?

Noah: It probably sounds like "turnip"—you know how those English town names are!

**Round 5 Dice: 4—3—2**

**Target Date: October 31, 1995**

**Comments before Round 5.** Here's what the participants had to say after seeing the results for Round 4:

**Steve Courtemanche.** COX has strengthened his position in the west and ARNE in the north. The low die rolls in Round 5 mean that some luck in the first race round may give both some good solo runs. Looking at race pairings, the strengths for the positions are COX (11–20s–40s, 14 and 16–20s and 60s–20s); DULL (10s–30s–50s and 60s–10s); WLLS (60s–50s–41 and 42 and 14–30s and 50s); and ARNE (60s–30s–40s.) Normal distribution of races should give an edge to COX and DULL.

**Tony Robbins.** With only 9 building points to play with, I decided that Linslade–E48 or B8–Newbury weren't adventurous enough, whereas building Reading–Oxford links the 10s and 20s, invades Mike's Oxford monopoly, and gets it built before (or possibly at the same time as) anyone else.

The more observant will notice that I wasn't tempted by the 6 points on offer at Windsor and Newbury—either someone else will build there whose track I can probably link to, or they'll still be available next time; it's more important to link to the 20s than to get more 10s.

**Mike Morris.** With only two cities left, I figured I had to go to one of them <grin>. No, actually, the build to Newbury does give me a north-south line, and gives me the South special run for 7 or 8 of my cities, which may come in very handy. And I may pick up another 6 points for the city (or 3, if DULL builds straight into it). My other options—building NE from east of Thame to Linslade, or building SW from High Wycombe to Reading—can hopefully still be pursued.

I used the last build segment to complete a line to Rickmansworth, since I would have to use Red's line to get there if I didn't have a line there myself. It will be interesting to see what is available next turn!

**James Goode.** I continue to be surprised by how much SW–NE building we are doing. COX has now joined in with a SW–NE line on the west end of the board.



DULL  
Robbins

COX  
Morris

WLLS  
Goode

ARNE  
von Metzke

## SPECIALS


1 = South  
(Reading,  
Newbury, Windsor,  
London)

2 = West  
(Newbury,  
H1, B41)

3 & 4 = North  
(H42, H43, H46,  
H59, H64,  
Buckingham,  
Bletchley)

5 = East  
(H66, H26,  
London)

6 = Shopping trip  
(London, Oxford,  
Reading, Luton)



3rd edition 21 May 95 redrawn by E. Brosius. Original c. 1980 by Ian Spittles.  
Railway Rivals by D.G. Watts, "Rostherne", 102 Priory Rd., Milford Haven, Dyfed UK SA73 2ED

Round 5

October 31, 1995

Red—Dunstable, Umpoloxi & Luton Lines (DULL)

Tony Robbins—Lincoln House, Creaton Rd., Hollowell, Northants, UK NN6 8RP tony.robbs@brookes.ac.uk

5a: (B8)—B7—E6.

5b: (E6)—H4.

5c: (H4)—I4—13.

[ 1→COX | 13 ]

Orange—Chilterns Overland Express (COX)

Mike Morris—23693 Glenbrook Lane, Hayward CA 94541 71340.370@compuserve.com

5a: (Didcot)—F2—E3—D2.

5b: (D2)—C2—B2—\*Newbury\*.

5c: (G19)—H19—Rickmansworth.

Lime Green—Will Lloyds of London Survive? (WLLS)

James Goode—211 Maplemere, Clarksville TN 37040 goodej@lynx.apsu.edu

5a: (M12)—Thame—L8.

5b: (A56)—B55—C56—D55.

5c: (J21)—Rickmansworth.

[ 1→COX | L8 ]  
[ 1→ARNE | D55 ]

Blue—[tune to "Hail Britannia"] (ARNE) Conrad von Metzke—4374 Donald Ave., San Diego CA 92117

5a: (J23)—L22—St. Albans—M24.

5b: (M24)—B65.

5c: (B65)—C65—Stevenage.

[ 2→DULL | K23 & M24, 3→WLLS | L22 ]

Financials.	Line	Start	Cities	Payments	Finish
	COX	75	+6	—, +2	83
	DULL	67		—1, +2	68
	ARNE	56		—5, +1	52
	WLLS	38		—2, +3	39

Round 6 Dice: 3-4-4

Target Date: November 27, 1995

# DIPCON XXIX

and

# WORLD DIPCON VI

together at

## ORIGINS 96

Here's all the details:

DC/WDC will be held in conjunction with Origins 96 in Columbus, Ohio on July 4-7th, 1996. Dip rounds will be Friday night, Saturday morning and Sunday morning. There will be a variant event on Saturday night. There will also be a team event. Early Sunday morning will play host to the Dipcon Society meeting. If that's not enough, the World Dipcon Society meeting will immediately follow. This promises to be entertaining, if not informative.

Registration: This will be handled by the Origins staff. You may get on their mailing list and order a prereg booklet by calling 1-206-204-5815 or email [ANDON@AOL.com](mailto:ANDON@AOL.com) or at Andon Unlimited PO Box 1740 Renton, WA 98057. The cost is \$35 and you will need to buy one pre-reg ticket at \$3. You will not need a ticket for each individual round. One ticket is good for the whole ball game!

Housing: The official Origins hotel is the Hyatt at a convention rate of \$85 a night. They can be reached at (614)463-1234. This hotel is connected to the convention center. If you're willing to drive a short ways, I can direct you to several other Red Roof type hotels in the Columbus area that will save you some \$\$\$\$.

We will have an room exclusively for our use at Origins. This has been a concern in the past that will not be a problem. The Origins staff will not have anything to do with Dipcon. That will be solely under the control of the Dipcon Committee.

Larry Peery is overseeing the WDC portion of the show. He's got quite a few foreign dippers ready to go and this should be one incredible Diplomacy tournament!!!!

\*\*\*\*\*

Here's what I'd like to have from everyone for the next update:

1. Variant ideas - I'm leaning towards 34 player Anarchy Dip. But that's not a given. Please provide your suggestions!

2. Questions on anything involving Dipcon/World Dipcon/ Origins, travel, Columbus. I'll do my best to answer them or get an answer for you.

3. Let me know if you're coming! Since Origins is handling the pre-reg, I won't have the names of attendees until the con itself. Let me here from you!!!! The Dipcon Committee is Steve Cooley, Dan Mathias Director of Scoring and me, Bruce Reiff Chairman. I can be reached the following ways:

mail: 2207 Smokey View Blvd, Powell, OH 43065    phone: work (614)431-4400 ext 260    home: (614)792-2764  
Email: [BDReiff@AOL.com](mailto:BDReiff@AOL.com)

# DIXIECON X

*The 10th Year of the Premier Diplomacy Event on the East Coast*

**The University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, NC**

**May 24-26, 1996  
(Memorial Day Weekend)**

This three-day event draws the best players from the South and beyond for a three-round Diplomacy tournament and other competitions. On Friday night, May 24, players congregate for tournaments in other games, with the Diplomacy action beginning the next morning. Playing in at least two of the three Diplomacy rounds makes one eligible for awards. Tournaments in other games such as Titan, History of the World, Magic, United, Miniatures and 1830 will proceed throughout the weekend also. Dixiecon was the site of the 1990 World Diplomacy Championships, and the 1994 North American Diplomacy Championships.

**Features Include: Three Round Diplomacy Tournament  
Plaques and Other Prizes  
Titan, Rail Games and Miniatures Events  
Inexpensive Campus Housing  
Experienced Convention Staff**

**\*\*For More Information Contact: David Hood, 2905 20th Street NE, Hickory NC 28601\*\***

# DIXIECON X

This three-round tournament features some of the best Diplomacy players in the country. In addition to the showcase tournament, there will also be events in History of the World, Magic, Titan, United, 1830 and miniatures. Please send the form below ASAP if you are interested in attending. A booklet with more specific information will go out to all preregistrants in late April.

The first official Diplomacy round will begin at 10:00 am on Saturday morning, with other events to take place on Friday night and throughout the Con. Rooms are available for rent on Friday, Saturday and/or Sunday nights at the rate of \$30 per room. A limited number of rooms are available for Thursday night as well. The rooms are air-conditioned, and feature free linen service (though you should bring a blanket yourself.) Please indicate on the form whether you want a room to yourself, or if you would rather share with someone. Also indicate if you have a roommate already lined up.

Free shuttle service will be available to those who fly into Raleigh-Durham International Airport, or to those who take Amtrak to Raleigh, Durham or Greensboro. Please get in touch with David Hood if you need assistance with your travel plans.

## DIXIECON X REGISTRATION FORM

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fees Enclosed:	\$15/night for a double room	_____
Checks payable to David Hood	\$30/night for a single room	_____
	\$15 for registration fee	_____


Please send to: David Hood, 2905 20th Street NE, Hickory NC 28601

Flapjack - 1995HD

**The GM: Douglas Kent    The Commentators:**

Brian Cannon  
Jim Grose  
Fred Townsend

### Winter 1901/Spring 1902 Results:



*Austria:* Bld A Tri,A Bud..A Tri-Ven,A Vie-Tyr,  
A Bud-Gal,A Ser S T. A Bul-Rum,F Gre-Ion.  
*England:* Bld F Lvp..F Lvp-Iri,A Lon H,  
F Nwy S G. F Den-Swe(NSO),F Nth-Ech.  
*France:* A Mar H,A Bur-Gas,F Ech-Mid.  
*Germany:* Bld F Ber,A Kie..F Ber-Bal,A Kie-Ruh,  
F Den S F Ber-Bal,A Mun-Bur,  
A Hol S F. A Bur-Bel(NSO).  
*Italy:* Bld F Nap..A Pie S F. A Bur-Mar(NSO),  
F Nap-Tyn,F Ion-Tun,A Tun-NAf.  
*Russia:* Bld A Mos..F Swe H,A Mos S F Sev,  
A Ukr-Rum,F Sev S A Ukr-Rum,A War-Ukr.  
*Turkey:* Bld F Con..A Arm-Sev,F Bla S A Arm-Sev,  
A Bul-Rum,F Con-Aeg.

PRESS

*Vie - Par: Slick!*

*Germany - France: Doh!*

*Vie - Mar: Oops!*

*Vie - Mos:* I tried to say hello last time, but the lines were all tied up with calls from Turkey and my message appears to have gotten lost. Brush his teeth, give him his shots, comb his hair and send the new ambassador on over.

*Vie - Ank:* The way you are going friend, I think you need to borrow a general from the Italians, not a diplomat from me!

*Vie - Ber:* Howdy neighbor, hang in there, in two or three years you'll get some sleep!

*Vie - Lon:* Nice recovery there milord.

*Turkey - Austria:* I hope my "years" of diplomatic efforts have yielded fruit among the Austrians. The alternative for Turkey is treachery and the start of a slide down the slippery slope (say that three times fast!) 'Twill be an interesting move, to say the least.

*Vie - Rom:* Sorry my friend, but I just had this sudden craving for pizza, and you just can't get good za around here.

*Sultan - Tsar:* In four months of real-time, I have received from you exactly one postcard full of fluff. I assume you prefer to write copious notes to the Archduke or to someone else other than your "closest" neighbor. So be it...just remember that Diplomacy usually involves diplomacy somewhere down the line.

*Rom - Lon:* Flip you for Gibraltar?

*Turkey - England and Germany:* Glad to see someone has grabbed the initiative this game! The Sultan would be most happy if you pressed home anti-Russian attacks in the north -- certainly wouldn't hurt my beleaguered nation! Press on, lads...

*Rom - Ber:* MMMmmmm, French Fries!

*Turkey - France:* Are you and the Tsar related? You both have enemies on your flanks, both are non-communicators, and both are in need of centers. As I've said before, Turkey's always willing to listen and help, but communication is a two-way street.

*Rom - Vie/Mos/Ank:* Play spin the bottle for Rumania? I'll let you three duke it out. Let me know when the war's over.

*Sultan - Italy:* I'll be most curious to see where your two fleets end up. I'm hoping this "conspiracy of silence" among my neighbors doesn't lead to a "conspiracy of action" with a three-tiered invasion! Nah, I'm not paranoid....

*Rom - Par:* Have I received a single communication from you yet? Where's that "silver tongue?"

#### Spring 1902 Commentary:

*Brian Cannon* - And now we see the IMPORTANCE of "diplomacy" (communication) in Diplomacy (with a capital "D"). Remember the last season where Austria & Russia had signaled mutual friendship by staying out of Galicia, Italy looked to be setting pretty, and the Sultan's back was bared for the knife. Faz, after a weak (or very trusting) opening, continued talking and dealing with his neighbors and the hard "diplomatic" work bears fruit as Austria stabs Italy and turns on Russia (helping Turkey into Rumania) all at the same time.

Meanwhile, France makes a tactical error by moving his Burgundian border guards to the rear (to Gascony) opening a path for the Kaiser's troops as England prepares to grab the strategic MAO (or to convoy an army onto the continent). Germany likewise makes a bid for Sweden (a stab of the Tsar) - assuming Mike (England) agrees to let him have it. Perhaps it is England who will be given Sweden to keep E/G growth balanced.

Either way, A/T should roll thru Italy in good order (unless Jamie can display some glittering Diplomacy of his own), and roll Russia back to Moscow & Warsaw (further progress will likely depend on E/G decisions). E/G should have little difficulty securing the North (grabbing Swe & St Pete) and taking out France (only a matter of time if Tom tries to rely on Tactics for his defense). What will happen then? Will E/G & A/T lock up in a Stalemate? Will E/T throw their former allies to the Witches? Will Jerry (Russia) manage to talk his way out of destruction? Will Jamie pull a Rabbit out of his hat? Where is Task Force 34? The whole world wonders.

*Jim Grose* - The most interesting move was Austria-Hungary's stab of Italy, while the most puzzling was France's voluntary withdrawal from both Bur and Eng.

Austria-Hungary and Turkey fooled everyone (even modest old me) and Russia and Turkey are now in big trouble. It will be interesting to see how long this new alliance holds.

While Russia may have expected Austria-Hungary

to attack Gal with support, that's all the more reason for him to have done likewise and, if successful, using Gal to attack Rum in the fall. They may have declared Gal a DMZ, but the press suggests otherwise. Russia should now be writing copious letters to his four neighbors, trying to join one of the alliances or break up an existing alliance and form a new one. Such efforts would not be aided by the situations in France and Italy, however, which encourage the existing E/G and A/T alliances to remain intact while going for the kill.

Italy should likewise be urging Turkey to grab Gre. At this point it's his only hope.

England and Germany are doing well against both Russia and France but France's moves were a surprise. I previously criticized him for moving to both Bur and Eng but what's done is done and he should not have voluntarily withdrawn from both. Did England and Germany "agree" with France to declare Eng and Bur DMZ and, if so, did he believe them? What he should have done is held both until evicted while withdrawing A Mar to take Spa or Por. A letter-writing campaign to Austria-Hungary, urging him to stab Italy, and another to Italy, warning of the coming stab, wouldn't have hurt. No doubt Italy will now agree to disengage and order A Pie-Ven but France, having let Germany into Bur, may still leave Mar covered. Very puzzling moves!

This game is rapidly turning into E/G vs. A/T.

*Fred Townsend* - What a wild game this has become. France builds zip the first year and didn't even NMR, and now that most difficult of two-way alliances, Austria/Turkey, has formed down south. This spells real problems for Italy and Russia. With Austria in Venice and Ionian, Italy's best move is Piedmont to Venice, Tyrr to Naples guaranteeing losing only one center. The strange Italian move from Tunis to N. Africa last turn instead of W. Med means he can't even try for Spain. A/T should eat his lunch quickly.

France will be feeding the Anglo-Germanic appetite, although his position is not completely hopeless,




almost but not completely. England has a guess on Brest, so France should gamble Eng is insisting on the sure center in Belgium to balance the German gain in Sweden. Moreover, Eng shouldn't be moving to Brest because he will want his F Irish to MAO to work as long as the Fleet MAO is not bounced anywhere. Furthermore, Germany's A Burg is likely to try for Paris because moving to Mars could be stopped by Italy as well as France. Why would Germany take the extra risk? Then if France assumes no problem from the Italian A Pied, he can move F MAO to Port and A Mars to Spain, A Gasc-Paris, hopefully bouncing Germany. Then he can build 2 with 3 open centers to build in.

This just goes to show how unbalanced Diplomacy is. Italy had a normal opening and is almost out of it after one move of the Austrian stab, while France does the dangerous and usually costly opening to the English Chan, gets out-guessed in Fall '01, builds nothing, is attacked by all three of his neighbors, and *still* has a chance to be at 5 in Fall '02.

Meanwhile, the situation around Sevastopol is very interesting. The obvious A/T moves are A Gal to Ukr, cutting one support for Sevastopol, allowing 3 Turkish pieces to take it. However, Turkey must attack from Rum or Russia can cut his Rum support by moving A Ukr to Rum. Thus, Austrian A Serbia must cover Rum, but if Gal doesn't go there, he will take it. A really wicked Russian move would be War to Gal, Ukr to War, and assuming Austrian A Gal goes to Ukr, Russia takes Gal and can bollix up Austria for a move or so. But with E/G attacking in the north, as long as the A/T alliance holds, Russia is eventually toast (another food metaphor, I'll write this after dinner next time).

This all assumes that the A/T and E/G alliances will hold together. They should for at least a year or so because all four have far more to gain that way. Of course insanity has gripped more than one Dip game, so we'll see.

#### Fall 1902 Results:



*Austria:* ~~A Gal-Ukr~~(ret Sil,Boh,Vie,Bud,OTB),  
A Ser-Rum,F Ion-Nap,A Ven-Rom,A Tyr-Ven.

*England:* F Iri-Mid,F Ech C A Lon-Bre,A Lon-Bre,  
F Nwy H.

*France:* A Mar-Spa,A Gas-Par,F Mid-Por.

*Germany:* A Hol-Kie,A Ruh-Mun,A Bur-Gas,  
F Bal-GoB,F Den-Swe.

*Italy:* A Pie-Ven,F Tyn-Nap,F Tun-Ion,A NAf-Tun.

*Russia:* F Swe H,A Mos-StP,F Sev-Rum,  
A Ukr S A War-Gal,A War-Gal.

*Turkey:* A Arm S A Rum-Sev,F Bla S A Rum-Sev,  
A Rum-Sev,F Aeg-Ion.

#### Supply Center Chart

Austria	Vie,Bud,Tri,Ser,Gre,Rum,Rom=7	Build 2
England	Lon,Lvp,Edi,Nwy,Bre=5	Build 2
France	Par,Mar,Por,Spa=4	Build 1
Germany	Kie,Ber,Mun,Hol,Den=5	Even
Italy	Ven,Nap,Tun=3	Remove 1
Russia	War,Mos,StP,Swe=4	Even
Turkey	Con,Smy,Ank,Bul,Sev=5	Build 1
Neutral	Bel	

#### PRESS

*Turkey - Russia:* To misquote Shakespeare, "Out, out cruel dot!" Your nest of pestilence in SEV must be cleansed of aggressive naval craft, so as to pose no threat to peace-loving Turks and Austrians everywhere...and we *will* be "everywhere" soon enough, Allah willing. You could've written at any time, but nooooo....

*Turkey - Austria:* Nice assists last turn (and this one?), Archduke! Here's hoping you continue to advance along the Italian boot. We shall support you any way we can.

*Turkey - Germany:* Hmmmm...getting a bit corpulent around the supply centers, aren't we? Well, it IS against France and Russia, so who can complain. Oh, a joke for you: Q: Do you know why all the roads in France are lined with trees? A: So the German army can march in the shade!

*Turkey - England:* Here's hoping you grow proportionately up north, Mike! Keep after that bad Frenchie, and "check six" from time to time. Let's try and effect a link-up in Russia somewhere, shall we?

*Turkey - France:* To quote the old saying, "Some days it doesn't pay to get out of bed." Hopefully you'll still *have* a bed after E/G get done ransacking your house! Hunker down in Iberia and help fight common foes!

*Turkey - Italy:* I would say the knife is a bit pointy in your ribs at the moment, Jamie. Well, here's hoping you can resolve the problem...you can play spin the bottle over Ven and Rom, and I'll wait to read about it in the paper.

#### Fall 1902 Commentary:

*Brian Cannon* - With the successful stab of Italy, Austria suddenly becomes a major force to be reckoned with. With two builds (and an Italian removal) it will be very difficult to prevent Austria from grabbing Venice AND Naples in 1903 - unless Italy gets help from Turkey & Russia (perhaps even Germany). A 9-center Austria with a secure western front (owing to the Anglo-French feud) and a Turkish ally has the force to crunch into Germany & Russia, guard against a stab, and still make a foray into the French countryside from which he can flank Germany's defenses. My question at this point is ... "How far will Mark string along with his Austrian 'friend'?" If Austria is fair and reasonable about the arrangement, Turkey should be able to pick up most of Russia out of the deal - but there his growth stops unless Austria arranges to support Turkey across the Med as well. Will Austria be greedy or work to keep a long-term A/T alliance in operation?

Out West, France actually gets a build in spite of a joint E/G assault. With Germany pulling all but one of his units back East (and no builds) France should be able to hold off Mike's England for quite some time - if he keeps his head and doesn't make any mistakes. If A/T keeps together and starts rolling (as is certainly possible) I'd look for some adjustments out West. England & France can't afford to remain locked while A/T picks off Russia, then Germany, and then rolls at them. On the other hand, if Tom is unable to find a good defense against England (leading to early French departure) or if A/T can't keep their alliance together, the stage would be set for a long-term E/G.

Up North, Germany looks like he is about to take on Russia (looking for a couple of builds). Whether this is wise depends on what arrangements Stephen has (or thinks he can get) with Mark's Turkey or Dave's Austria. If he doesn't have a good plan for splitting up A/T, taking on Russia may just mean a quicker A/T triumph with Germany on the dessert plate. He can hold the center with England's help - but his southern Flank (thru Marseilles) is very vulnerable (or will be in a year or so).

So, at this point, I'd look for Mike & Stephen to continue the assault on France for another season or two - with a weather eye on the A/T fortunes. I "hope" Germany is talking with Russia, Turkey (& Austria) voraciously!! If he is not, he may be in for a tough time in the not too

distant future.

\*\*\* Remember this, as you view any Diplomacy Game: No country is an Island ... not even England! What happens in/to one country affect every other country on the board. If Italy dies (as seems likely) Austrian units will be poised to invade France. If A/T roll thru Russia (as seems likely) E/G will need all their force to stop the A/T steamroller ... and that will include a strong presence in the French area. A German assault on Russia may well lead to early A/T victory in the East which leads to almost mandated peace between England & France - probably on France's terms (he having the least to lose being already on the ropes).

Keep your eyes on THIS game ... it's getting INTERESTING !!!

*Jim Grose* - Russia was lucky in Sweden but may still be gone in a year. He arrived in Gal three moves too late. His only hope is to toady to Turkey yet he apparently refuses to write.

Italy is also in a precarious situation. He, along with Russia, should be urging Turkey to stab Austria-Hungary.

Did France plan to fight it out in Iberia with two units or did he expect German A Bur-Gas rather than MAr? Regardless, he must now retake Gas and Bur and persuade England or Germany to change sides.

Turkey is advancing smartly and should take Mos next. Does he plan to let Austria-Hungary keep Rum?

England's in a secure position with many possible strategies to choose from. Since no one else seems to want it, why doesn't he convoy to Bel next?

Why didn't Germany take Bel? If he wanted to cover Mun but advance A Bur-Gas, why didn't he at least move A Hol-Ruh? For that matter, why didn't he try for Par or Mar? What good is a lone army in Gas? What possible purpose does A Kie serve? In the worst move of the season, why did he order F Bal-GoB rather than F Bal S F Den-Swe?

Austria-Hungary is doing quite well. Diplomacy and sound tactics have put him in the lead. Two of his neighbors are on the ropes, another is marching in circles and the fourth is his ally. Austria-Hungary replaces

Germany as my choice for the eventual winner.

*Fred Townsend* - Fall 1902, and its four against three. England and Germany are after France and Russia and (as is somewhat unusual) Austria and Turkey are attacking Italy and Russia. The questionable move prize for this turn goes to the English F Nwy holding. Why didn't he bounce Moscow into St. Pete or, even better, support Germany into Swe? This is a question Germany is probably asking himself. And now E/G have a guess over Swe and Norway, as Russia can use St. Pete to support Swe into Norway or attack Norway from St. Pete.

Perhaps by way of compensation, the English convoy to Brest was superb. France's moves and my suggestions were exactly the same, and were based on the assumption that England would make sure of a build by convoying to Belgium. The risk of convoying to Brest is that if the French Army Gascony had attacked Brest, England would have been at 4, build zip, while France would be at 5, building in Brest and Mars. But England took the risk and reaps the reward of a better position, a

weaker France and Belg still open for a center in '03.

Meanwhile down south, Austria, Turkey and Italy move as predicted with Russia making a slight variation of supporting himself into Gal from Ukr rather than Ukr to Warsaw. His move has the slight negative of allowing Austria to retreat to Silesia while building A Vie and Bud to take out Gal. Of course, Austria may build A Tri in order to capture Venice in which case he could retreat to Bud, build Vie (or vice versa) and still take Galacia.

Note also that Austria is at 7 while his ally Turkey is only at 5. This is as it should be. Austria is taking most of the risk allying with Turkey who will be in the superior position behind Austria after Russia and Italy are gone. Thus Austria should generally insist on staying a center or two ahead to decrease the temptation of a Turkish stab.

Will both alliances hold? They should for several turns until Russia, France and Italy are all out or down to one or two centers. But Gonsalves (England) is a wild card and the other three have been known to try something wild now and then. Stay tuned.

---

## The Diplomacy World Commentary Column: Foolhardy #20

### Buying the Rights to Diplomacy:

(TIM LURZ) I would like to comment on the idea of AH farming out Diplomacy. The comments found in DW concerning a private group taking control of Diplomacy were all very nice, but they didn't say the magic word, "profit." Playing the game of Diplomacy and playing the game of making Diplomacy a financial success are quite different.

AH's marketing strategy is sorely lacking. Is it any wonder that the company is having money troubles? Who is in fact doing AH's marketing; it is we the players. We introduce the game to our friends, put out zines, etc. This is not enough.

Suggestions: 1.) Improve quality control. A good example of this is Colonial Diplomacy. The quality of the board, design flaws, and the lack of pieces is unacceptable. A company the size of AH should not produce crap and then expect us to buy it. It's simple: customer satisfaction.

2.) Target a broader base of potential customers. To do this, produce an Educational version of the two Diplomacy games for High School and Jr. High level History and Geography courses. Produce a textbook. Produce a teacher's guide. Give teachers an incentive for introducing the game to their students. This does two things: gives free marketing and increases the customer base. The earlier they experience the game, the longer they will be customers.

Broaden the game. Make it more international. Produce rules in other languages. Chinese, Korean, Japanese. If you can't make money in Asia, you're not going to make it anywhere.

Why can't the game of Diplomacy have return customers? Give updates. Produce one new variety of board every year. The idea is to have old customers giving new money. In every set of Diplomacy, have a registration card that automatically signs a player up for a "newcomers" only PBM zine. Have a "Kiddy" zine. Sell them a high quality product, keep their interest, smother them with love and attention, and take their new money every year or so.

If people are going to take over the promotion of Diplomacy, treat it as a business, not a hobby. The worst thing to do would be to do it half-assed, like our friends at AH.

(BRENT MCKEE) If we want the game to reach a wider audience, I suspect that what we should want is for a major company with a national or international marketing ability already in place, like Parker Brothers, to buy the rights. We in the Hobby have a proprietary feeling for the game. It is after all our chosen recreation. But what do most of us know about the marketing, production, and distribution of games?

### Hobby Recruitment:

(BRENT MCKEE) See if you can't get Stephen Agar to write an article about the Hobby Advertising Project that he ran in the UK. From what I've read he placed ads in games magazines, but also in other publications with a history bent. Maybe that's an idea to be considered, along with ads in college newspapers. We should also look at a coordinated effort to get posters into local game stores. I've tried that and had some enquiries.

### World DipCon:

(BRENT MCKEE) I don't know what Mark Fassio is getting so irritated about. Okay, I know Larry Peery wants to organize things to death, but I happen to like the idea of World DipCon. I'd like it even more if I could afford to attend it regularly (at all, actually), but maybe this year. Mark's statement about the Super Bowl is a non-sequitur; what does one thing have to do with the other? You have one Super Bowl for American Football because you have only one league in the world of any quality. Personally I think the comparison we should be looking at is the World Cup. What the rest of the world calls football and we call soccer has one (so do hockey (ice and field) and rugby). The British don't say that because they invented soccer, their national champion should be referred to as the World Champion and the champions of other soccer playing countries should pound salt. Why not the same attitude for Diplomacy? Oh, and by the way, Monopoly does have a world championship. So does Scrabble.

### Player Ratings:

(JIM GROSE) I've been active in this hobby for five years and have played games in eight different zines but it was only in a recent issue of The Canadian Diplomat that I first saw the results of the latest Marco Poll and American Diplomacy Postal Ratings.

The Marco Poll ranks based simply on total votes rather than averages. This unfairly penalizes high quality/low circulation zines and players who are not widely known.

The Postal Ratings look promising but there is no accompanying explanation of the methodology. How are points assigned? What time period is covered? Does this only cover the most recent, say, five years or does it include all games on record? If the latter then older players may be resting on their laurels while newer players face an unfair handicap. This is only a minor objection. Whenever I begin a game with people I've never played with before I try to find out from them and others just how experienced they are (and how much I can try to dupe them). A ratings system based on past results is an excellent tool.

What especially surprised me was Buz Eddy's statement that these ratings have only been picked up and published twice!

*{Doesn't surprise me too much - especially when you consider how little attention people pay to polls these days, even long-time attractions like the Runestone Poll. Players know if they are doing well or not...those who do well don't like to advertise that fact, and neither do those who do poorly! I guess it would be a good thing if there was an agreed-upon rating system, but since we can't ever get together and agree on even simpler things, the odds of getting one are pretty damn low.}*

### Hobby Archives:

(BRENT MCKEE) Maybe it's the historian in me, but I like the idea of archives, and I especially love the idea of the Hobby Archives. I think we should move them, provided that once they are moved they are used. And before anyone tells me to put my money where my mouth is, I already have.

*{I'm pleased to report that the archives have now been successfully moved from Walt Buchanan's place to Jamie McQuinn's new house (with the help of Brian Alden). With luck, Jamie will find the time and inclination to use the archives for some sort of publication, or at least he'll reprint some classic material in his own zine. I certainly look forward to either of those!}*

---

## New Blood

The following individuals have expressed an interest in seeing samples of Diplomacy zines:

Jim Ferdette, HHC 721st MI BN, Ft. Gordon, GA 30905

Michael Guth, 8905 Second Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910

Nate Johnston, 227 McGuffey - UVA, Newcomb Hall Station, Charlottesville, VA 22904

Clyde Longest, 3 Jules Circle, Newport News, VA 23601

Manuel Lopez, 3I-D Main Street, Charlestown, MA 02129

# New Zealand PBM Championships - Blueprint for Disaster

by Brendan Whyte

The experimental New Zealand PBM Championship has collapsed in a conflicting web of rumor and accusation. Ben Easton of Chameleon Games proposed the championship as a way of bringing the small and disparate gaming hobbies in New Zealand together, to give each a taste of the others. The idea was for each commercial PBM company, pbm zine and university (or other) club to nominate 2 or 3 top players to compete in a game annually, the GM being rotated amongst the proposing bodies, and along with it, choice of game. Initially, Dip was proposed to be run by me (as Ben does not have enough Dip experience as of yet). With 17 players, I set out to run a Mercator variant, that would finish within the year if run on 2-3 week deadlines.

Players were drawn from Chameleon, Circle Games, Damn the Consequences, NMR, Auckland University's AMERICA Role Playing club, and others. Unfortunately, the roleplayers, and even the commercial gamers had had little experience with Dip or its variants, and mercator is a little more complex than regular Dip, so initially the strategies were trial and error, despite the circulation of a strategy handout sheet with the initial rules and map.

The game was plagued with player dropouts from the start, and a lack of interest from both from starting players and others who could have been used as standbys. The GM, yours truly was forced to take over positions to keep the game in balance as the dropouts were not in random positions on the board. This did not meet with the full approval of the players, although it rapidly became necessary as more of the 17 dropped.

My move to the US in September put the game on hold for several weeks, but the next turn, only 6 of the remaining 10 players put in orders. At this point, I considered it a farce, and cancelled the game, despite my interest in continuing this variant.

I think the concept was flawed to begin with. While the various sub-hobbies in New Zealand are small and often mutually exclusive (apart from the roving likes of John Dods amongst others), and the need for exposure to the other facets of the hobby are strong, nearly everyone is in the subhobby of their interest and liking. I personally do not play commercial or Roleplaying games, and others (too many it seems) seem to hate Dip, as the poor showings at cons illustrates (apart from a small 2-board con in Auckland a few years back). There is little ftf played to my knowledge, unless by new purchasers of the game, unaware of the pbm hobby. This too is going into decline, with the nonappearance of NMR for many months, and the hiatus of DtC with my own relocation. Dods' View From Another Shore is well dead, and John seems unlikely to get involved in amateur Dip for a while longer. Maybe once his kids

grow up... The STG club at Auckland University has moved to Magic (yes, even we were suckered into this evil) just after the Warhammer phenomenon, both of which captured the hearts and minds of the younger school kids and university lot; and now the original Dippers there have nearly all converted, moved on, stopped subbing to DtC and NMR etc. Whether the trophy that Ben bought for the NZ PBM championship ever gets awarded is debatable, although rumor has it that a game of "starlords" or "Feudal somethings" will be this year's game, but I have heard nothing. DtC 63 is out in the great nether-region that is the USPS, meandering its way back to New Zealand.

Will the NZ hobby survive? I cannot say, but even in our corner of the world, the renaissance that Dip experienced in the heady late 80s seems well over. Only if new and young university or highschool players are recruited, or maybe if the new editions of Dip, Colonial Dip and the long awaited Machiavelli result in some new players, will we see a resurgence of gaming as was so pleasurable for me nearly a decade ago. The problem is figuring out how to let the purchasers and users of games sold here know that there is a PBM hobby besides the commercial one. But in the mysterious way that info on such things circulates around campuses (at least in Auckland: there seems to be minimal hobby activity outside of there and Wellington) maybe this will still happen. It always amazes me how many people have played or even heard of Dip when you bring it up casually in conversation. That's how I got into it all...so there is life in the game even with the infamous Kiwi apathy.

*{Brendan Whyte, a New Zealand national now attending college in California, is also the publisher of Damn the Consequences.}*



## Hobby Services:

**International Subscription Exchange(ISE):** The ISE coordinator acts in concert with ISE's of other nations to allow easier exchange of foreign currency between hobby members. This allows Dip players in one country to subscribe to a zine from another country without the hassles of currency exchange. Ideally there should be one ISE coordinator in each country with a postal hobby: In the US and Canada (although he prefers US dollars if it can be done) the ISE is Jim-Bob Burgess at 664 Smith St., Providence, RI 02908-4327 or via Internet at [burgess@world.std.con](mailto:burgess@world.std.con). In the UK it is Iain Bowen at 5 Wiggen Terrace, York, YO3 7JD, UK.. In Australia it is John Cain at P.O. Box 4317, Melbourne University 3052, Australia.

**Boardman Number Custodian(BNC):** This person records Diplomacy gamestarts and finishes, and assigns Boardman Numbers to each game. In the US the current BNC is W. Andrew York at PO Box 2307, Universal City, TX 78148-1307.

**Miller Number Custodian(MNC):** Records variant gamestarts and finishes (a BNC for Diplomacy variants): Lee Kendter, Jr., 1503 Pilgrim Lane, Quakertown, PA 18951.

**Zine Register:** Zine Register is a detailed guide to all known Diplomacy zines in the North American hobby. Currently handled by Michael Lowrey, 6503-D Fourwinds Dr., Charlotte, NC 28212.

**Novice Packets:** Tom Mainardi, 45 Zummo Way, Norristown, PA 19401 offers Master of Deceit. Fred C. Davis of 3210K Wheaton Way, Ellicott City, MD 21043 offers Supernova. I believe Fred is asking a \$1.00 for Supernova, and Master of Deceit is available for free upon request. Bruce Linsey of 170 Forts Ferry Road, Latham, NY 12110 offers Once Upon a Deadline (a novice packet for publishers) for \$5.00.

**North American Variant Bank(NAVB):** NAVB is a catalogue of variants and all are for sale from the NAVB Custodian. The current NAVB Custodian is Lee Kendter Jr., 1503 Pilgrim Lane, Quakertown, PA 18951.

**Pontevedria:** A list of known game openings in Dip zines in North America. A must for all people actively looking for Diplomacy and Dip variant game openings! Available for \$0.50 from W. Andrew York, P.O. Box 2307, Universal City, TX 78148-1307.

**Diplomacy World Anthologies:** Larry Peery offers anthologies of Diplomacy World issues. There are currently 7 volumes available, plus two more due for publication in the Fall of 1995. Larry also has a stock of back issues of DW on hand. You can contact Larry at 6103 Malcolm Drive, San Diego, CA 92115. His Email address is [Peeriblah@aol.com](mailto:Peeriblah@aol.com).

## Game Openings

The following are some zines that currently list game openings available. It is suggested that you request a sample of any zine before you decide to play there. Samples are often free, but a courtesy payment of \$1 or a few unused stamps is recommended. For a more complete and detailed list of current game openings, order a copy of Pontevedria (information in the column to the left).

Batyville Gazette - Ralph Baty, 4551 Pauling, San Diego, CA 92122. Openings include Diplomacy, Anarchy, and Invasion.

Boast - Herb Barents, 17187 Wildemere, Detroit, MI 48221. Openings include Diplomacy.

Boris the Spider - Paul Bolduc, 203 Devon, Ft. Walton Beach, FL 32547. Openings include Diplomacy, Colonial Diplomacy.

Costaguana - Conrad von Metzke, 4374 Donald, San Diego, CA 92117. Openings include International Diplomacy.

Crimson Sky - Michael Gonsalves, 530 Treasure Lake, DuBois, PA 15801. Openings include Diplomacy.

Graustark - John Boardman, 234 East 19th, Brooklyn, NY 11226. Openings include Diplomacy.

Making Love in a Canoe - Brent McKee, 901 Avenue T North, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7L 3B9, Canada. Openings include Diplomacy, Colonial Diplomacy.

Maniac's Paradise - Doug Kent, 10214 Black Hickory Rd., Dallas, TX 75243. Openings include Diplomacy, Gunboat, Kremlin, Civilization.

Metamorphosis - David Wang, PO Box 1325, Summit, NJ 07902. Openings include Diplomacy, Gunboat, Star Trek Diplomacy.

Perelandra - Pete Gaughan, 1236 Detroit #7, Concord, CA 94520. Openings include Blind Diplomacy.

Rambling WAY - W. Andrew York, POB 2307, Universal City, TX 78148. Openings include Diplomacy, Gunboat, Fog of War.

Ramblings by Moonlight - Eric Ozog, PO Box 1138, Granite Falls, WA 98282. Openings include Colonial Diplomacy.

Tactful Assassin - Eric Young, 4784 Stepney, RR #2, C2, Armstrong, BC V0E 1B0, Canada. Openings include Diplomacy, Gunboat.

Yellow Pajamas - Paul Milewski, 4154 Allendale #2, Cincinnati, OH 45209. Openings include Diplomacy, Gunboat.